College of St. Thomas Library
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

WITHDRAWN
UST
Libraries

THE LIFE AND TIMES

OF

SAMUEL BOWLES

BY

GEORGE S. MERRIAM

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II

NEW-YORK

THE CENTURY CO.

1885

COPYRIGHT, 1885, by
GEORGE S. MERRIAM.

PN
4874
.B63
M551
v.2

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

PART VI. 1865-1868.

CHAPTER XXXI.—Across the Continent: The new America.—A two-thousand-miles stage-ride.—The mountains from Denver.—California at a glance.—The Columbia.—Western character.—Business men of the coast.—"Society."—The cry for the Pacific railroad.—Civilization through the stomach.—Yo Semite.—The great republic.....1-15

CHAPTER XXXII.—Reconstruction: The *Republican* in the new era.—Immediate or gradual re-admission.—The "intelligent-suffrage" plan.—President Johnson and Congress.—Thad Stevens.—A quarrel brewing.—The President's vetoes.—"Conservative party" attempted.—Fails.—Congress tries its hand.—Fourteenth Amendment.—The Reconstruction Act.—Exclusion of Southern leaders.—The Radicals.—The President impeached.—The seven senators.—Nomination of Grant.—Of Seymour.—Election.—Results of reconstruction.....16-45

CHAPTER XXXIII.—Letters (1865-68): To Mr. Allen, Mr. Dawes, John Pierce, Mrs. Bowles, Miss Whitney.—Editing *Across the Continent.*—"A wise despair."—Mr. Frothingham.—Moderate ambition.—San Francisco critical.—Among the Alleghanies.—Reform in business.—In the whirl at Washington.....46-58

CHAPTER XXXIV.—Lights and Shadows: Personal development.—Widening range.—Disappointment.—The Nemesis of overwork.—Nature's access to peace.—The need of passivity.—Incapacity of surrender.—The Higher Will..... 59-67

101663

CHAPTER XXXV.—Works and Ways: As seen by his staff.— New workers on the *Republican*.— Their reminiscences.— A midnight visit.— The daily routine.— Diversions.—Favorite resorts.— Horses.— Hospitality.— Dinner parties.— The Club.— At Amherst. — A college trustee.— "The Switzerland of America."— Flowers and mountains.— An Indian scare.....68–85

PART VII. 1868–1872.

CHAPTER XXXVI.— The War Against Corruption: New conditions and new problems.— Criticism and reform needed.— The man and the time.— Opposes Butler for Congress.— The *Nation*.— James Fisk, Jr.— The Hartford and Erie raid.— Controversy with David Dudley Field.— Butler seeks the governorship.....86–109

CHAPTER XXXVII.— Grant's First Administration: The ideal and the real Grant.— Choosing a Cabinet.— The party chiefs.— Smooth sailing.— Clouds gather.— The Treaty of Washington.— Annexation of San Domingo proposed.— Quarrel with Sumner. — Senators in opposition.— The unquiet South.— Kuklux.— Personal government.— Attempts at civil-service reform.—The duties of citizenship.....110–138

CHAPTER XXXVIII.— Family Life — Letters (1869–1871): A resting-place.— Sympathy with children.— Training in responsibility.— Guests.— Letters to Mrs. Bowles, his daughter, Mr. Dawes, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bryan, General Pierce, Miss Whitney, Mrs. Calhoun-Runkle.— Mr. Dawes and the Speakership.— To the Pacific with his wife.— Woman's Rights.— His children abroad.— Home pictures.— A day's routine.— Visits Europe.— Broken vitality.— Current events.— Europe again.— Recuperation.....139–174

CHAPTER XXXIX.— The Greeley Campaign: Liberal Republicans in Missouri.— Cincinnati convention called.— Its motives and its recruits.— The Adams candidacy.— Horace Greeley.— Independent editors.— How the nomination was made.— How received.— Republicans renominate Grant.— Issues and spirit of the canvass.— The *Republican's* isolation.— A battle well lost.— The death of Greeley.....175–200

CHAPTER XL.— A Dissolution of Partnership.—Division of the firm proposed.— The motives.— The decisive interview.— The establishment of the *Union*.— Personal alienations.— Against wind and tide 201–209

CHAPTER XLI.— Letters (1872): To Mr. Dawes, Mr. Allen, and General Pierce.— The experience at Cincinnati.— Reasons for supporting Greeley.— Talking across the picket-line.— Advice and remonstrance.— Friendly foes.— Personal assaults.— Shaking hands 210–221

PART VIII. 1873–1877.

CHAPTER XLII.— Grant's Second Administration: Independence and partisanship.— The Credit Mobilier.— The currency question.— Inflation bill passed.— Grant vetoes it.— Appointments to Chief-justiceship.— Rogues and reformers.— Commercial crisis of '73.— Democratic victory in '74.— Louisiana Returning-board. — Congress investigates. — Returning-board rebuked.— Force policy revived.— Fails.— Sherman's Resumption bill.— Bristow and Jewell.— Resumption in Ohio, reform in New York, reconstruction in Mississippi.— The Democratic House.— Blaine revives war issues.— Bristow and the Whisky Ring.— Cabinet scandals.— Fifth Avenue conference.— Blaine under investigation.— Hayes nominated.— Tilden nominated.— Their letters of acceptance 222–263

CHAPTER XLIII.— Massachusetts Politics: The *Republican* and Mr. Dawes.— Butler again.— The right of bolting.— Collector Simmons.— The succession to Sumner.— The Chapin and Alexander contest.— The "machine."— Its defeat in '74.— Dawes chosen senator.— A neutral campaign.— The Bristow movement.— Subsidence and revival of partisanship 264–277

CHAPTER XLIV.— Hayes and Tilden: The rekindling of sectionalism.— Inconsistencies of the campaign.— The result in doubt.— Who shall count the votes? — The Returning-boards elect Hayes.— Congress takes fire.— A sober second thought.— Mining and counter-mining.— The Oregon case.— The Electoral Commission bill.— The country re-assured.— The question before

the commission.—Equity, or technicality?—The award.—Its reception.—A last struggle.—The new Administration.—South left to itself.—Reformers to the front.....278–306

CHAPTER XLV.—Public and Private Conflicts: For rest, fresh toil.—Improves the *Republican*.—Springfield in its later growth.—Mayorship offered.—Long fight with railroad jobs.—Last trip to Europe.—The Alexander contest.—The Willis Phelps libel suit.—Brother leaves the office.—The penalties of public criticism.—Establishing the Union Relief.—City charter.—"Pone" and his master 307–328

CHAPTER XLVI.—Letters (1873–1876): To Mrs. Bowles, Mrs. Hooker, Mrs. Calhoun-Runkle, Clark W. Bryan, Frank B. Sanborn, George W. Smalley, General William F. Bartlett, Murat Halstead, Robert Pomeroy, Newton Booth, Henry L. Dawes, Charles Allen.—Election of Boutwell over Dawes.—Mayorship.—To a newspaper letter-writer.—Political tendencies.—The position of women.—Charles Kingsley.—State politics.—In Paris.—At Seven Oaks.—The Chapin-Alexander contest.—Dawes chosen senator.—A grandfather.—Tilden.—Bristow.—President-making and tobacco smoke.—Meddlesome office-holders.—A starvation diet.—Death of General Bartlett.—The disputed Presidency..329–356

PART IX. 1877–1878.

CHAPTER XLVII.—A Glance at the "Republican": The amount of the work.—Its quality.—Characteristics of the *Republican*.—Unity.—A novice's surprises.—Making an item.—Critical temper.—Prosecuting attorney.—Combative and conciliatory methods.—Professional and personal standards 357–362

CHAPTER XLVIII.—The Ethics of News-giving: The modern sovereign.—The topics of one day.—The mercantile and moral aspects.—Scandal.—When admissible.—The *Republican's* libel suits.—Details of vice.—Feeding the higher tastes.—Reporting and leading opinion.—The London *Times*.....363–378

CHAPTER XLIX.—The Higher Journalism: Two kinds of influence.—The newspaper as teacher.—The *Republican's* imper-

sonality.—Dr. Holland.—Mr. Hood.—Characteristic passages.—On Rufus Choate.—On General Bartlett.—On California.—On Ralston.—On divorce.—On rights and duties of women.—On Goethe.—Attitude toward the churches.—Religious changes in a half-century.—Letter to Dr. Huntington.—The field is the world.—The old teacher and the new 379–403

CHAPTER L.—Personal Glimpses: A secretary's reminiscences.—Story by Mr. Dawes.—Hobnobbing with Blaine and with Butler.—As a visitor saw him.—Sauntering.—Among the Bostonese.—Every-day ways.—Twilight talk.—With a friendly woman.—Gathering flowers.—A street interview.—"I'm tired and cross."—On the hill-top 404–415

CHAPTER LI.—The Farewell: At the goal.—Western journey.—Letters to Mrs. Bowles, Murat Halstead, Henry Watterson, Carl Schurz, President Hayes, Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler, Henry M. Spofford, Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker, George W. Smalley, Henry L. Dawes.—Changed bearing.—"Warrington's" last days.—Pressing cares.—The railroad riots.—Letters to Judge Spofford, D. W. Bartlett, George D. Robinson, Charles Nordhoff, Francis Tiffany, Miss Whitney.—Parting interviews.—Paralytic stroke.——Facing death.—Two sick-beds.—The end 416–440

CHAPTER LII.—In Memoriam: Burial.—Memorial service.—Words of tribute.—Newspaper estimates.—Judged from the pulpit.—A living monument.—His contribution to politics.—To journalism.—A child of the age.—The education of life 441–461

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF
SAMUEL BOWLES.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Across the Continent.

"IT is five years since I was last in the West. Then I came to attend the convention that nominated Mr. Lincoln for President. How long ago that seems! What century of other history has held such revolutions, has wrought such influences on the present and future of the world, as these five years! What five years of all life, of ours or anybody else's, would you or I exchange for even our witness of these?"

So wrote Mr. Bowles to the *Republican*, in May, 1865. Almost before the thunder of the guns had died away, he was starting on a tour of exploration of the western half of the country. This was to be a free and united nation, from the Lakes to the Gulf, from the Atlantic to the Pacific;—now, to see what kind of a home awaited the gigantic young family as it spread away from its Europe-neighboring cradle by the Alleghanies!

It was a party of five travelers;—Schuyler Colfax, Speaker of the House,—Lieutenant-governor Bross, of Illinois, and of the Chicago *Tribune*,—Albert D. Richardson, of the New York *Tribune*, distinguished as a war correspondent,—Mr. Bowles,—and, in charge of the

party, George K. Otis, agent of Ben Holladay, the creator of the Overland Stage Line. "Our party," wrote Mr. Bowles afterward to Mr. Colfax, "were almost the first that had ever traveled across the continent simply to see the country, to study its resources, to learn its people and their wants, and to acquit ourselves more intelligently thereby, each in our duties to the public,—you in the government, and we as journalists." The far West was own child of the East, but the child was then almost unknown to the parent. The Pacific Railroad was scarcely begun. To reach the western coast, the traveler must ride two thousand miles in stages, or make a three weeks voyage by the Isthmus. New York was farther from San Francisco than it is to-day from Constantinople. The Pacific communities were so isolated that during the war they could maintain a specie currency while the East used paper depreciated to one-half or one-third of its face value. The scenery of the grandest half of the country was far less known to the people of the other half than that of Europe. The Yo Semite had but a hundred visitors in a year, and was uncelebrated in literature. The natural resources, the tendencies of society, the relative importance in the nation's future, of the whole region west of the Missouri were very vaguely appreciated by the rest of the country. To explore and make report of this unfamiliar land was an enterprise as well suited to the genius of Mr. Bowles as any which he ever undertook. Its fruit was a series of letters to the *Republican*, which were made up almost without change into a volume, inscribed to Schuyler Colfax, and entitled "Across the Continent." The book received wide and high praise, and had a sale of fifteen thousand copies.

This field was one that roused all his enthusiasm. He was in the strongest sympathy with the communities

among which he was traveling. In Europe he was always a stranger and foreigner. Europe's appeal to an American is largely through his sense of a historic past. Mr. Bowles's interests and sympathies were all with the present and future. The nascent, forming civilization of the West, full of struggle, of uncertainty, of doubtful promise, woke all his interest. He was a sharer as well as a spectator. This belonged to *his* country, this fell within the lines of *his* work. The scenery, in its novelty, its vastness, its magnificence, was a delight that alternated with the strong human interests of the journey. No eyes saw more than his. Nothing escaped him, from a flower to a quartz-mill,—from the passing expressions of Brigham Young's face to Mount Hood standing like the great white throne of the Apocalypse.

This is what he describes from Denver:

"All my many and various wanderings in the European Switzerland, three summers ago, spread before my eyes no panorama of mountain beauty surpassing, nay, none equaling, that which burst upon my sight at sunrise upon the Plains, fifty miles away from Denver, and which rises up before me now as I sit writing by the window in this city. From far South to far North, stretching around in huge semicircle, rise the everlasting hills, one after another, tortuous, presenting every variety of form and surface, every shade of cover and color, up and on until we reach the broad snow-covered range that marks the highest summits, and tells where Atlantic and Pacific meet and divide for their long journey to their far distant shores. To the North rises the king of the range, Long's Peak, whose top is fourteen thousand six hundred feet high; to the South, giving source to the Arkansas and Colorado, looms up its brother, Pike's Peak, to the height of thirteen thousand feet. These are the salient features of the belt before us; but the intervening and succeeding summits are scarcely less commanding, and not much lower in height. . . . No town that I know of in all the world has such a panorama of per-

petual beauty spread before it as Denver has in this best and broadest belt of the Rocky Mountains, that rises up from the valley in which it is built, and winds away to the right and to the left as far as the eye can see — fields and woods and rocks and snow, mounting and melting away to the sky in a line often indistinguishable, and sending back the rays of the sun in colors and shapes that paint and pencil never reproduced, that poetry never described. These are sights that the eye never tires of — these are visions that clear the heart of earthly sorrow and lead the soul up to its best and highest sources."

Mr. Bowles had an eye for topography, and the art of bringing before the reader a relief map by a few words of description. Here is his word-map of California:

"California, as you will see by the map, is like a great basin or bowl, between two ranges of mountains. Along the Coast runs one; and the Sierras, two hundred miles east, separate her from Nevada. The Golden Gate at San Francisco lets in the ocean and out her interior waters; to the north from that city stretch the Sacramento River and its tributaries through a plain two hundred miles long and forty to fifty wide; to the south the San Joaquin (pronounced San Walk-in) repeats the same; and the two, with all the drainage of the interior, all the inside waste of both ranges of mountains, meet above San Francisco, and spread out into the wide inland bays, twenty to fifty miles long and four to ten wide, that give to that city its beauty, its wealth, and its commerce; and delaying here, they leisurely balance accounts with the ocean through its narrow gateway.

"San Francisco hangs over the edge of its chiefest bay, like the oriole balancing on the crest of his long pocket nest; peeping around the corner into the Pacific, but opening wide eyes north and south and east to the interior. To the north and south, the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys are shut in by the two ranges of mountains chassezing into each other. And this is California. The side valleys from the Sierras are the field of the gold diggings and the quartz mining; their mates over the way, inside the Coast range, and among its foot hills, squeezing first and longest the spongy clouds from the

ocean, get the most rain, and are the kindest to the husbandman; while the broad intermediate plains, along the main rivers, wait somewhat on irrigation or a better understanding of the mysteries of their wealth."

The party made a visit in Salt Lake City, where they conferred freely with both Mormons and "Gentiles," examined the principal mines in Nevada, and from San Francisco traveled, principally by stage, to Oregon and Washington, stepping across to British soil at the extreme north-western corner of the Union, and voyaging some hundreds of miles up the Columbia. Of the portrayal of that river this is a part:

"That it ranks among the three or four great rivers of the world, and that it is the key to vast political and commercial questions and interests,—giving to its line the elements of a powerful rivalry to the great central commercial route of our continent, of which San Francisco is the Pacific terminus,—no one who examines its position and extent, and witnesses the various capacity of the territory it waters, can for a moment doubt. As yet, however, the Columbia is most known abroad for the rare beauty and majesty of the scenery developed by its passage through the great Andean range of north-western America. Alone of all the rivers of the West has it broken these stern barriers, and the theater of the conquering conflict offers, as might naturally be supposed, many an unusual feature of nature. River and rock have striven together, wrestling in close and doubtful embrace,—sometimes one gaining ascendency, again the other, but finally the subtler and more seductive element worrying its rival out, and gaining the western sunshine, broken and scarred and foaming with hot sweat, but proudly victorious, and forcing the withdrawing arms of its opponent to hold up eternal monuments of its triumph."

Writing from Denver, he makes this comment on the Western people in general:

"Most agreeable of all our experiences here are the intelligent, active, earnest, right-minded and right-hearted young

men and women we meet, people many of whom have been here for years, but, instead of losing anything of those social graces that Eastern towns and cities are wont to think themselves superior in, have not only kept even pace in these, but gained a higher play for all their faculties, and ripened, with opportunity and incentive and necessary self-reliance, into more of manhood and womanhood. . . . I see less drunkenness, I see less vice here among these towns of the border and of the Rocky Mountains than at home in Springfield. I see personal activity and growth and self-reliance and social development and organization, that not only reconcile me to the emigration of our young people from the East to this region, but will do much to make me encourage it. To the right-minded, the West gives open opportunity that the East holds close and rare; and to such, opportunity is all that is wanted, all that they ask."

The Californians are described with discriminating frankness. Thus, of business methods and character in San Francisco:

"Some of the finest qualities are mingled with others that are both shabby and 'shoddy.' There is sharp, full development of all material powers and excellences; wealth of practical quality and force; a recklessness and rioting with the elements of prosperity; much dash, a certain chivalric honor, combined with carelessness of word, of integrity, of consequence; a sort of gambling, speculating, horse-jockeying morality, born of the uncertainties of mining, its sudden heights, its equally surprising depths, and the eager haste to be rich,—that all require something of a recasting of relationships, new standards, certainly new charities, in order to get the unaccustomed mind into a state of candor and justice. . . . Ten or fifteen years of stern chase after fortune, among the mines and mountains and against the new nature of this original country, has developed men here with a tougher and more various experience in all the temporalities of life, and a wider resource for fighting all sorts of 'tigers,' than you can easily find among the present generation in the Eastern states.

. . . In consequence partly of all this training and partly of the great interests and the wide regions to be dealt with, the men I find at the head of the great enterprises of this Coast have great business power,—a wide practical reach, a boldness, a sagacity, a vim, that I do not believe can be matched anywhere in the world. London and New York and Boston can furnish men of more philosophies and theories,—men who have studied business as a science as well as practiced it as a trade,—but here are the men of acuter intuitions and more daring natures; who cannot tell you why they do so and so, but who will do it with a force that commands success."

Of "society" in San Francisco:

"'Society' in this representative town of the Pacific Coast is somewhat difficult of characterization. It holds in chaos all sorts of elements; the very best, and the very worst, and all between. There is much of New York in it, much of St. Louis and Chicago, and a good deal that is original and local,—born of wide separation from the centers of our best social civilization; of the dominating materialism and masculinism of all life here; of comparative lack of homes and families and their influences. There are probably more bachelors, great lusty fellows, who ought to be ashamed of themselves, living in hotels or in lodgings in this town, than in any place of its size in the world. There is want of femininity, spirituality, in the current tone of the place; lack of reverence for women; fewer women to reverence than our Eastern towns are accustomed to. You hear more than is pleasant of private scandals, of the vanity and weakness of women, of the infidelity of wives. Paradoxical as it may appear, by contrast with Eastern society, the men seem of a higher grade than the women,—better as men than the latter as women. Nor is this inconsistent with reason; the men, dealing with great practical necessities and duties, are less harmed, on the whole, by the dominating materialism of life here, than the women whose pressing responsibilities are lower and fewer;—as a fine, delicate blade is more roughened in cutting the way through brambles and brush than a tougher and broader edge.

"All which is not only natural, but inevitable. In all new countries, where the first fight is for life and wealth with rough nature, the masculine quality must ever be dominant; and the feminine elements must be influenced by it, more than they influence in return. The senses rule the spirit. All civilization, all progress, tends to the increase of the feminine element in our nature, and in life. Contrast the centuries, and we see it creeping in everywhere, in men and women alike, in religion, in intellectual culture, in art, in social intercourse,— softening, refining, hallowing,— the atmosphere of all modern life pictures. Women who possess and represent this blossom of our civilization are by no means wanting here,— no more perfect specimens have I met anywhere; tender, tasteful, true, and gaining in aggregate influence over society day by day; but yet not to-day representing or making what is called 'society.'

"The ladies generally dress in good taste. But the styles are not so subdued as in our Eastern cities; a higher or rather louder tone prevails; rich, full colors and sharp contrasts; the startling effects that the Parisian demi-monde seeks,— these are seen dominating here. In costliness of costume, too, there is apparently rivalry among the San Francisco ladies. Perhaps in no other American city would the ladies invoice so high per head as in San Francisco, when they go out to the opera or to a party or ball. Their point lace is deeper, their moire antique stiffer, their skirts a trifle longer, their corsage an inch lower, their diamonds more brilliant, and more of them — than the cosmopolite is likely to find elsewhere."

Naturally, San Francisco was not pleased when it read some of these criticisms; and Mr. Bowles was, as usual, surprised that any sensibilities should be ruffled by his plain-speaking! Here is another view:

"In affairs of public morals and education and religion, there is much activity in San Francisco, and a healthy progress in the right direction is visibly constant. The New England elements are clearly dominant here and through the whole Pacific Coast region; softened from their old Puritanic habits,—

marrying themselves to the freer and more sensuous life of a new country with a cosmopolitan population, but still preserving their best qualities, of decency, of order, of justice, of constant progress upward in morality and virtue. . . . Ambition and pride in the things that are respectable and proper are singularly prominent; and men contribute lavishly to build fine school-houses and support churches, whose lives are not especially controlled by the influences that school-houses and churches create. . . . All this coast and its interior mining districts have great need to-day of earnest, unsectarian Christian ministers and missionaries. The people are in the main responsive to right appeal; they are eager to develop all the institutions and elements of the best civilization, and will contribute liberally of money, whenever they have it, in aid thereof; but it is no holiday work that invites those who would lead them. The men and women who engage in it should come with resolute heart, and the power and willingness to rough it in some respects, and come to stay at least five years."

He describes the people of Oregon and Washington as constituting the New England of the western coast. One of the most striking letters is upon the necessity of the Pacific Railroad. It discusses questions of cost, route, etc., sagaciously and comprehensively; and this is the key-note of its appeal:

"To feel the importance of the Pacific Railroad, to measure the urgency of its early completion, to become impatient with government and contractor at every delay in the work, you must come across the Plains and the Mountains to the Pacific Coast. Then you will see half a continent waiting for its vivifying influences. You will witness a boundless agriculture, fickle and hesitating for lack of the regular markets this will give. You will find mineral wealth immeasurable, locked up, wastefully worked, or gambled away, until this shall open to it abundant labor, cheap capital, wood, water, science, ready oversight, steadiness of production,— everything that shall make mining a certainty and not a chance. You will find the world's commerce with India and China eagerly waiting its opportunities.

You will see an illimitable field for manufactures unimproved for want of its stimulus and its advantages. You will feel hearts breaking, see morals struggling slowly upward against odds, know that religion languishes; feel, see, and know that all the sweetest and fairest influences and elements of society and Christian civilization hunger and suffer for the lack of this quick contact with the Parent and Fountain of all our national life. . . . Tender-eyed women, hard-fisted men, pioneers, missionaries, the martyrs and the successful,—all alike feel and speak this sentiment. It is the hunger, the prayer, the hope, of all these people. Hunger and prayer and hope for "Home," and what home can bring them, in cheap and ready passage to and from, of reunion with parent and brother and sister and friend, of sight of old valley and mountain and wood, of social influence, of esthetic elevation, of worldly stimulus and prosperity. . . . Men of the East! Men at Washington! You have given the toil and even the blood of a million of your brothers and fellows for four years, and spent three thousand million dollars, to rescue one section of the Republic from barbarism and from anarchy, and your triumph makes the cost cheap. Lend now a few thousand of men and a hundred millions of money, to create a new Republic, to marry to the Nation of the Atlantic an equal if not greater Nation of the Pacific. Anticipate a new sectionalism, a new strife, by a triumph of the arts of Peace, that shall be even prouder and more far-reaching than the victories of your Arms. Here is payment of your great debt; here is wealth unbounded; here the commerce of the world; here the completion of a Republic that is continental; but you must come and take them with the Locomotive!"

When this was written, in August, 1865, though enormous congressional grants had been offered three years before, the Central Pacific had not gone sixty miles eastward from Sacramento, while the Union Pacific had not laid a rail of its main road west of the Missouri. Mr. Bowles declared that the whole line ought to be completed within five years. The last link in the iron girdle

of the continent was clasped at the meeting-point in Ogden on the 10th of May, 1869,—two thousand miles of railroad built within four years.

Of the Mormons, this is his summing-up:

"The result of the whole experience has been to increase my appreciation of the value of their material progress and development to the nation; to evoke congratulations to them and to the country upon the wealth they have created, and the order, frugality, morality, and industry that have been organized in this remote spot in our continent; to excite wonder at the perfection and power of their church system, the extent of its ramifications, the sweep of its influence; and to enlarge my respect for the personal sincerity and character of many of the leaders in the organization; — also, and on the other hand, to deepen my disgust at their polygamy, and strengthen my convictions of its barbaric and degrading influences. . . . The nation and the government may oppose it and punish it, without at all interfering with the existence of the Mormon church, or justly being held as interfering with the religious liberty that is the basis of all our institutions. Here, by the people, who are coming in to enjoy the opportunities of the country for trade and mining, and there, by our rulers at Washington and by the great public, this single issue of polygamy should be pressed home upon the Mormon church,— discreetly and with tact, with law, and with argument and appeal, but with firmness and power."

Here is a characteristic observation:

"If there is one thing, indeed, more than another, among the facts of civilization, which the Pacific Coast organizes most quickly and completely, it is good eating. From the Occidental at San Francisco to the loneliest of ranches on weekly stage routes, a 'good square meal' is the rule; while every village of five hundred inhabitants has its restaurants and French or Italian cooks. . . . When the Puritans settled New England, their first public duty was to build a church, with thrifty thought for their souls. Out here, their degenerate sons begin

with organizing restaurants, and supplying Hostetter's Stomachic Bitters and an European or Asiatic cook. So the seat of empire in its travel westward changes its base from soul to stomach, from brain to bowels. Perhaps it is only in obedience to that delicate law of our later civilization which forbids us to enjoy our religion unless we have already enjoyed our victuals, and sends a dyspeptic to hell by an eternal regard to the fitness of things."

Of all the scenery beheld by the party, the crowning wonder was the Yo Semite.

"The Yo Semite! As well interpret God in thirty-nine articles as portray it to you by word of mouth or pen. As well reproduce castle or cathedral by a stolen frieze or broken column, as this assemblage of natural wonder and beauty by photograph or painting. The overpowering sense of the sublime, of awful desolation, of transcending marvelousness and unexpectedness, that swept over us, as we reined our horses sharply out of green forests, and stood upon high jutting rock that overlooks this rolling, upheaving sea of granite mountains, holding far down its rough lap this vale of beauty of meadow and grove and river,— such tide of feeling, such stoppage of ordinary emotions, comes at rare intervals in any life. It was the confronting of God face to face, as in great danger, in solemn, sudden death. It was Niagara, magnified. All that was mortal shrank back, all that was immortal swept to the front and bent down in awe. We sat till the rich elements of beauty came out of the majesty and the desolation, and then, eager to get nearer, pressed tired horses down the steep, rough path into the valley.

"And here we have wandered and wondered and worshiped for four days. Under sunshine and shadow; by rich mellow moonlight; by stars opening double wide their eager eyes; through a peculiar August haze, delicate, glowing, creamy, yet hardly perceptible as a distinct element,— the New England summer haze, doubly refined,— by morning and evening twilight, across camp-fires, up from beds upon the ground through all the watches of the night, have we seen these, the great

natural wonders and beauties of this western world. Indeed, it is not too much to say that no so limited space in all the known world offers such majestic and impressive beauty. Niagara alone divides honors with it in America. Only the whole of Switzerland can surpass it,—no one scene in all the Alps can match this before me now, in the things that mark the memory and impress all the senses for beauty and for sublimity."

The general impression from the scenery of the whole journey is summed up in the Introduction of the book:

"Neither the Atlantic states nor Europe offer so much of the marvelous and the beautiful in Nature, such strange and rare effects — such combinations of novelty, beauty, and majesty — as were spread before us in our ride Across the Continent, through the mountains, and up and down the valleys. No known river scenery elsewhere can rival that of the Columbia, as it breaks through the Continental mountains; no inland seas charm so keenly as Puget Sound; no mountain effects are stranger and more impressive than those the Rocky and the Sierras offer; no atmosphere so fine and exhilarating, so strange and compensating, as California's; no trees so majestic and so beautiful as the Sequoia Gigantea,—aye, and no Vision of Apocalypse so grand, so full of awe, so full of elevation, as the Yo Semite valley!"

Yet the traveler kept his allegiance to his native soil. In one letter he wrote:

"The climate of all this Pacific Coast certainly presents many solaces and satisfactions in comparison with our own New England. I do not wonder the immigrants hither find new health and life and much happiness in its great comparative evenness; but I do not yet recognize that which would compensate me for the loss of our slow, hesitating, coying spring times, our luxuriously-advancing, tender, red and brown autumns, aye, and our clear and crisply cold winter days and snow-covered lands, with the contrasting evergreens, the illuminated sky, the delicately fretted architecture of the leafless trees, the sunsets, the nerve-giving tonic of the air. Surely

there is more various beauty in the progress of the New England year than any which the Pacific Coast can offer."

This is the moral impression of the journey:

"How the Republic, saved, reunited, bound together as never before, expands under such personal passage and footstep tread; how magnificent its domains; how far-reaching and uprising its material, moral, and political possibilities and promises! There is no such knowledge of the nation as comes of traveling in it, of seeing eye to eye its vast extent, its various and teeming wealth, and, above all, its purpose-full people — growing only greater in personal power and activity as they grow fewer in numbers. We think our Yankee leaders have active brains and comprehensive hands, but the pioneers in the civilization of the West impress you as men of broader grasp and more intense vitality. The very breadth of their field expands them."

So, again:

"Greater the wonder grows at the extent of the Republic, but larger still our wonder at the mysterious but unmistakable homogeneity of the people. San Francisco, looking westward to the Orient for greatness, cooling its summer heats with Pacific breezes, thinks the same thoughts, breathes the same patriotism, burns with the same desires, that inspire New York and Boston, whose outlook is eastward, and which seem to borrow their civilization with their commerce from Europe. Sacramento talks as you do in Springfield; Nevada, over the mountains, almost out of the world, anticipates New England in her judgments, and makes up her verdict while those close to the 'Hub of the Universe' are looking over the testimony."

The journey home was made by steamer. From New York the travel accomplished is thus summed up:

"We have gone together from ocean to ocean, across a continent; from longitude one degree to longitude thirty-four degrees; from latitude fifty degrees to latitude seven degrees;

traveled in all some twelve thousand miles, half by sea, nearly a third by stage, and the balance by railroad and river; crossing the great mountain ranges of the continent; exploring the forests, the mines, the commerce, of the new world; seen and learned the field of a new empire; enjoyed the most generous of hospitality in every possible and imaginable form; and are back in our homes in a trifle more than four months from the day of leaving them. All without the accident of a finger's scratch, all without breaking for a moment the harmony of our personal circle."

Add to this that the party were treated everywhere as public guests; that at every town on the Pacific Coast they were met by the inevitable brass band; that Mr. Colfax averaged a speech a day; that receptions, dinners, and balls were unintermitted; and that Mr. Bowles, besides his private correspondence, wrote to the *Republican* letters sufficient to make a book of 400 pages. The journey was a fresh qualification for his service to the public. Emerging from the fevered and passionate atmosphere of the war, he was lifted out of its resentments and rancors into an enlarged, inspiring view of the great peaceful destiny beckoning all the children of a common country. He gained knowledge through which he could interpret the East and the West to each other. He helped to summon the forces that built the Pacific Railroad. He was burning his candle at both ends—but he was helping to make history.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Reconstruction.

IF ever to human eyes an event seemed untimely, it was the death of Abraham Lincoln. The whole genius and character of the man fitted him for a peacemaker, and he died at just that moment in the nation's history when the peacemaker's work was most needed. To reunite the North and South after the war demanded generous temper, firm will, and cool head; fidelity to great ends, with shrewdness, patience, adaptability, as to means,—demanded, in a word, the very combination of qualities which Lincoln possessed, and which belonged neither to President Johnson nor to the congressional leaders.

The wonder is that the work of Reconstruction was as well done as it was. Twenty-one years ago, two peoples were in deadly struggle, the one of them including a great servile class; to-day they constitute a thoroughly united nation, free, harmonious, prosperous, and with full courage for such difficulties as still confront it. Yet among the men who administered the government at the epoch of Reconstruction, there was scarcely one whom history will pronounce in any full sense of the term a great man. Shall we call it a supreme instance of the self-governing power of a great people; or shall we see in it the action of beneficent Providential forces,

using as their instruments even the infirmities and follies of men? We are warned at least against an indolent trust, by seeing that we still suffer from some evils which are due to the mistakes of that time, and might have been avoided had wiser counsels and a nobler temper prevailed.

The essential work of Reconstruction fell principally within the years 1865-8. Within that time the lines were drawn and the new foundations established. For many years later, "the Southern question" remained one of the great topics of political discussion; but with the full readmission of almost all the seceded states before the end of Johnson's administration, the general basis of the new order was determined, and clear-sighted men recognized that another class of questions were coming to the front.

The *Republican* never showed a more statesmanlike quality than in this period. During the anti-slavery phase of politics, and up to the time of Lincoln's proclamation of freedom, it never quite identified itself with the highest political forces of the time. There lingered in it some trace of the materialism of the Webster school. But the editor had grown under the teaching of events. The war period gave a severe schooling, and Mr. Bowles had grown in a direction in which few men did grow who shared like him the stress of that time. He had become not only loftier, but broader; not only more fervent in patriotism and humanity, but more fair-minded and tolerant. To this result in him something was doubtless contributed by the bitter discipline of bodily weakness. A manly nature profits by being made to sharply feel its limitations, and from the sense of its own infirmities learns patience and generosity toward other men.

At the end of the war two courses were open to the victorious government. The one was to treat the South-

ern communities as if in the same position they held before their revolt, except for the abolition of slavery. The other course was to hold those states in temporary subjection to the general government, and prescribe by Federal authority the laws and constitutions which they must accept before restoration to self-government. Lincoln was disposed to intrust the state organizations to their old constituencies so far as these appeared to loyally accept the restoration of the Union. But this he proposed to do in a guarded and tentative way, watching the workings of the experiment awhile before coming to any finality. Johnson proposed to follow in Lincoln's footsteps, but for a cautious experiment he substituted a dogmatic theory. When the lately rebel states acquiesced in the overthrow of secession and slavery,— as they all hastened to do,— the President took the ground not merely that they should in policy be at once restored to their old places in the Union, but that they were already members again of the equal sisterhood of states, entitled to self-government and to representation in Congress.

This view had the finest constitutional logic to support it. But the logic of facts — facts past and present — was fatally against it. The communities which had just been in rebellion showed indeed no slightest disposition, then or afterward, to again defy the national authority. But most of them proceeded immediately to enact codes of laws on the topics of labor, contract, crime, etc., of which the effect was to deprive the freedman of almost every civil right beyond the nominal ownership of himself. The codes contained as much of the spirit and substance of slavery as was possible without its name. The North recognized at once that the effect of this would be to defeat one of the great ends for which it had fought — universal freedom; while even the other —

national unity — might be insecure, were the franchise confined to the class which had tried to overthrow it. No such settlement as this was to be tolerated. It was preferable, — such was the sound political instinct of the Republican party, — that the normal constitutional relation of the Southern states, which had been interrupted by their own act in the war, should be held in suspense awhile longer, until the victors should have enforced such changes in the organic law of the nation as would effectually guard both Union and freedom. But the party and its leaders hesitated and groped their way as to what constitutional changes were necessary. The Republican party was long in accepting the direct establishment of manhood suffrage by the Constitution. It felt its way to this result through various expedients and indirections.

The Springfield *Republican* at an early period took the ground that the true settlement of the Reconstruction problem lay in a constitutional amendment giving the suffrage to all men who could read and write. This is the provision of the Massachusetts constitution. It was placed in that instrument as an amendment in 1857, after it had been for years under discussion, the *Republican* having been one of its earliest advocates. The paper was forecasting the best treatment of the new problems before hostilities had ceased; it opposed the idea advanced in some quarters of holding the South awhile under military rule, and favored Lincoln's ideas as he began to practically apply them in Louisiana. So early as March 8, 1865, it summed up a careful discussion of the impending problem, in this conclusion:

"We are inclined to think it desirable that there should be established a uniform basis of national suffrage, and that its conditions should be, in general, lawful conduct, and the ability to read the Constitution and to write one's name. . . . The

men we want for this office of voting are not white men, black men or yellow men, Chinamen, Irishmen, Germans, or American-born, but knowing men, well-disposed toward the law."

During the summer of 1865 it discussed the situation in a broad, calm, practical temper, without passion or dogmatism; sympathetic toward President Johnson's effort to restore the Southern communities at once to working relations with the general government, but recognizing that the effort must be experimental. It steadily ripened to the conviction that the nation must establish the full equality of blacks and whites before the law. Early in September it pronounced definitely for the establishment of suffrage irrespective of race, with the sole qualification of ability to read and write. It always thereafter urged this as the best solution of the whole problem. It opened the new year, 1866, with an editorial urging a constitutional amendment to this effect, and followed up the subject in a series of strong articles. As it became apparent that Congress lacked either the wisdom or the strength to follow this plan, the *Republican*, with practical philosophy, followed where it could not lead, and labored to strengthen and liberalize the series of measures by which Reconstruction was worked out.

The perplexities involved in the re-adjustment of the nation's political bases were great enough to task the most considerate statesmanship. But they were aggravated by a personal contest, hot and bitter, between Congress and the President. When Congress met, toward the close of 1865, the Republican members were already suspicious and half-hostile toward the new President, who had shown himself in such haste to restore the lately rebellious communities. These members reflected the prevalent temper of the North. The North was heated from recent conflict, and strenuous to protect all

it had fought for; regarding the rebellion as a gigantic crime; seeking no personal revenge, unless in the case of Jefferson Davis as the representative leader of rebellion; but profoundly distrustful of the lately revolted communities, and especially of their political chiefs; eager to protect the freedmen in their civil rights, but doubtful of intrusting the suffrage to their inexperienced hands. The President, honest and patriotic, was narrow-minded; he was filled with the one idea that with the end of the war the constitutional order was restored in full force, and that South Carolina and Mississippi were immediately entitled to self-government equally with Massachusetts and Illinois. He was earnest, narrow, pugnacious; unguarded in speech; tinctured with the coarseness of the "poor white" class from which he sprung; easily stung to passion; and he was wrought soon to consider himself the guardian of constitutional order against a usurping Congress.

The *Republican* did its best toward allaying the rising discord. It was temperate and just toward both the President and Congress. The quarrel came to a head in February, 1866, when Congress passed the Freedmen's Bureau bill, establishing a temporary military jurisdiction over cases involving the rights of freedmen, and the President vetoed it as unconstitutional. The Republicans in Congress flamed out in wrath against the President. Their ablest spokesman and manager was Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, who had become during the war the leader of the House. At the time of his death, August 12, 1868, the *Republican* thus sketched his character:

"When the hour came, the man was ready,—not with broad views, wise doctrines, good taste, faultless manners, or exemplary morals,— but resolute, shrewd, unsparing; willing to use friend or foe, careless of both, possessed with his cause and

that alone, and equal to every occasion. When his hour passed, as it did long before his death, he was judged to be harsh, coarse, ignorant, unreasonable, and troublesome,—he was a revolutionist in a period of reaction and organization. But to estimate him merely thus is as unjust as to call him the saviour of his country or the first of statesmen. He had passed a long life in training for his work, which began in 1859 and ended in 1867,—by that he is to be measured, and not by what preceded or followed. The new era of American nationality felt his powerful clutch and impetus, and the effect of his work will remain on our Constitution and polity, longer than that of Webster, of Clay, or of Calhoun."

Upon the veto of the Freedmen's Bureau bill, hot words were rained on the President's head. He answered by charging Congress with attempting a counter revolution; and in speeches from the White House balcony, excited by the cheering crowd, he denounced by name Sumner, Stevens, and Wendell Phillips. The *Republican* favored the Freedmen's Bureau bill, but discussed with respect the able and lucid arguments of the veto. President Johnson's state papers were generally far superior to his speeches, and showed the influence if not the hand of Mr. Seward, who remained in the cabinet and adhered to the President's cause.

The crisis brought Mr. Bowles to Washington, and he wrote to his paper (Feb. 26):

"Distrust, suspicion, the conceit of power, the obstinacy of theory, the infirmities of temper on both sides, have brought affairs to the very verge of disorder and ruin." "There is no occasion," he said (March 1), "for any independent impartial citizen to join the President's party or the anti-President's party. There is so much right on both sides — so much wrong on both sides — so much reason to hope and expect that the difference may be made up, that they may be excused from taking sides and need not be tempted to degrade themselves and destroy their power for good by rushing into the

arena." "The great point" (March 3) "is to secure protection and justice to the freedmen. The ballot would have best done this; but President, Congress, and the country, all agree in rejecting that, and agitation and conversion must be waited for to secure this great right and principle. For the present the Freedmen's Bureau, military occupancy, and United States Courts must be our reliance. . . . We want the President firm and resolute on this point, and we want to arouse the better class of the Southern people to their duty in the same regard — to make them active as they are now but passive objectors to the wanton cruelty of the lower and meaner classes toward the ignorant negroes. To gain these results we may well concede much in the way of theory, much in the way of immediate admission of loyal representatives,"— which last measure was the one most urged by the President. Especially, continues the writer, must the President be kept in sympathy with the Republican party by fair and friendly treatment,— though this will be most difficult.

Mr. Bowles's criticism upon the Republicans (March 9) was:

"The conspicuous lacking of Congress seems to be of faith that the political and social revolution of the war will go on to its fruition. The South has well learned that it cannot circumvent God, and Congress and the North may well reflect that his work will proceed to its own definite perfection even without their manipulation of all the details. The experiences of the war should have taught us all something more of patience, something more of faith, something more of modesty, than are apparent."

But the President's course soon made it impossible to look to him for coöperation in protecting the freedmen. The Civil Rights bill, establishing by national authority the civil equality of races, was vetoed, and on grounds so broad as to forbid all action whatever by the general government in behalf of the freedmen. This made a direct issue inevitable.

"It is no matter," said the *Republican* (April 4), "how much the President says he does not intend to leave the Republican Union-party — they must and will leave him. For though they might give up everything else,— waive universal suffrage, concede the admission of Southern congressmen, abolish the test oath, grant general amnesty,— they cannot give up national protection to the weak and minority classes at the South, during this reorganizing state of society after the rebellion. It is the sequence of their platform,— it follows from the suppression of the rebellion,— it is as clear a principle of the Republican party, as palpable a duty of the national authority, as that two and two make four. The party is nothing if it does not do this — the nation is dishonored if it hesitates in doing it."

The President had now arrayed against himself so strong a majority in Congress that his vetoes were systematically set aside. He could oppose thereafter only a fitful and ineffectual resistance. The control of the country's destiny, so far as it was vested in any political authority, lay in the hands of Congress through the rest of Johnson's administration.

Some attempt was made to rally a "Conservative" party, under the President's leadership. A mass convention including delegates from North and South was held in Philadelphia in August, 1866. The *Republican's* treatment of this gathering illustrated one of its characteristic traits. It was always desirous that its opponents should take the best and highest ground. The partisan wants the opposite party to do bad and foolish things, in order that the people may thereby be driven to support his own party. The *Republican* always wanted both parties to be patriotic and honest, so that, whichever prevailed, the nation would be well served. It recognized too that virtue in one party spurs its opponent to a necessary emulation, while the sins of either one allow the other

to lower its standard. The Philadelphia convention united in hearty declarations of loyalty many Southerners who had fought for the Confederacy. The *Republican* thus commented (August 18):

"Why should not every patriotic heart rejoice in the success of the Philadelphia convention movement? Every really pious soul is cheered by the conversion of a sinner, even if he does not join a favorite church. It is enough that he ceases to sin and rebel and comes to believe in God and hell. No matter if his God has less lovely attributes and his hell is of a different temperature from ours. Only a sectarian bigot prefers that a man should continue in iniquity and rebellion against the Divine Light and Love, rather than be redeemed in the form of another faith than his own. Only the bigoted partisan — always identifying danger to his political party with danger to the country and its cause — prefers that rebels and copperheads should continue rebels and copperheads, rather than become loyalists and Unionists in an opposing party. But to all patriotic hearts it is much that these men of the South and the North, who were so lately either in open arms against the government, or in sullen inactivity while it was in peril, now blossom forth in the raiment of loyalty, accepting their defeat and all its results, and seek opportunity to bury the memory of their crimes against the Union by eager service for its unity and its nationality. No matter if we cannot restrain a feeling of distrust of their sincerity, and are disposed to put them on probation a little longer — their professions and their activity for the Union are great improvements on their past, and will have a healthful influence on themselves and all associated with them. This movement puts an end to disunion threats and disunion parties."

The President soon destroyed whatever chances there might have been for his success. He traveled about the country making a series of violent and inflammatory harangues, which showed him an utterly unfit instrument for any "Conservative" party.

"The conduct of the President," said the *Republican* (September 13), "has destroyed both his policy and his party in the North. . . . This instinct of loyalty and safety, taking refuge in the organization that led the country through the war, and upon whose intelligent moral elements the country rightly feels that it can rest securely, is the significant and cheering sign of the times. . . . The first duty is to swell the strength and the voice of the Republican party and *give it power to be both generous and just to all sections and to all parties.*"

Mr. Bowles reported sympathetically the enthusiastic and radical state convention of 1866, which had for its president Benjamin F. Butler, and adopted a platform drawn by William S. Robinson ("Warrington"), and calling for impartial suffrage. During the seven weeks of the state campaign, the paper kept as a standing heading, in italics, a sentence of Horace Maynard's:

"Let our laws and institutions speak not of white men, not of any race or complexion; but like the laws of God, the ten commandments, and the Lord's prayer, let them speak of PEOPLE."

But the paper did not warp or disguise its judgment of party leaders. It classed Butler, then one of the congressional chiefs, and a favorite with the crowd, with Andrew Johnson and Stephen A. Douglas, though the comparison fails to do justice to the real patriotism of the rugged little Tennesseean. It said (September 17):

"The Conservative party has broken down because its head proves no true conservative. He belongs to the same class of American politicians as Mr. Douglas and General Butler — rude, strong, passionate natures, with great force of character, often wielding great popular power, useful for much of the work of a new and struggling nation, the men for revolutionary periods and revolutionary labor, yet ever naturally and properly distrusted by the finer instincts around them, and rarely

safe guides through periods of desired calm and peaceful reconstruction and progress."

The paper protested (September 18) against the "rough and bloody doctrines" of confiscation, disfranchisement and punishment of all who had shared in the rebellion, which were urged by such Republicans as Butler, Brownlow, and Stevens; and against "the narrowness and bigotry that is just now rampant with the *Tribune*, and in some other Republican quarters." But it held (November 22) that the time was not ripe for a general amnesty, and that such a measure ought not to precede but to follow the settlement which should re-admit the Southern representatives to Congress.

The autumn elections of 1866 showed that the Republicans were overwhelmingly dominant in the North. The Democrats were not strong enough to be useful as an opposition. The whole responsibility of deciding the terms of Reconstruction now lay with the Republican majority in Congress, its hands strengthened by this vote of popular confidence. The effort to frame an ultimatum had resulted in the previous June in the Fourteenth Amendment, which Congress had then proposed to the states for their ratification. The amendment was, in the *Republican's* words, "a shabby piece of joiner-work,"—seeking by indirection some ends which the framers did not venture to aim at directly. The first clause asserted the civil rights of citizenship for all persons born or naturalized in the United States. The second clause based congressional representation on population, with the provision that should a state exclude any of its adult males from the suffrage on other grounds than crime or rebellion, its basis of representation should be reduced in corresponding ratio. This was designed to deter the states from excluding the freedmen

from the suffrage, by the penalty of a proportionate loss of representation in Congress. The third clause excluded from all Federal or state offices any who had taken an official oath of fidelity to the United States government and had afterward engaged in rebellion; this disability being removable by a two-thirds vote of Congress. The fourth clause affirmed the validity of the United States debt, and forbade the payment by state or nation of debt incurred in support of the rebellion, or of compensation for emancipated slaves; and the fifth clause empowered Congress to enforce the others by appropriate legislation.

This amendment was before the states in the winter of 1866–7. The lately seceded states were administering their own local governments, but were still occupied by Federal troops, and the freedmen were somewhat under the protection of Federal officials, while the states had still no congressional representatives.

Congress now proceeded to prescribe the final terms on which these states might be restored to their normal relations. It passed over the President's veto an Act of Reconstruction, and a series of supplemental acts as they seemed called for during the following spring and summer; and it was on this basis that the political restoration of the South was actually accomplished. The plan, summarily stated, was this: The South was temporarily divided into five military districts, and the commanders of these were made paramount for the time over the local civil authorities. In each of the states a constitutional convention was to be chosen, by the vote of all adult males except those disqualified from office by the terms of the Fourteenth Amendment; and the constitution framed by this convention must establish an equally wide electoral franchise. The constitution must be then ratified by a popular vote. When a state

constitution had been thus framed and ratified,—when Congress had approved it,—when a legislature elected under it had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment,—and when that amendment had become a part of the Constitution,—then the state was to be restored to full self-government, and its senators and representatives admitted to Congress.

The measure was comprehensive in its scope, was unflinchingly enforced, and before the presidential election in 1868 all save three of the lately rebel states had complied with its requirements and resumed theoretically their normal relations to the Union. For eight years longer, Congress and the President exercised from time to time an undefined power of interference. But the permanent frame-work of the new order was provided by the Reconstruction Act. One of its features — the admission of the blacks to the suffrage — was extended impartially and irreversibly to the whole country, by the adoption, a few months later, of the Fifteenth Amendment. Another leading feature — the exclusion from suffrage and office of all who had participated in the rebellion after taking the official oath of allegiance — was intended to shut out from public offices all those who had been up to this time the political leaders of the Southern communities. It was adopted under the idea, widely prevalent among Republicans, that the rebellion had been a conspiracy and a crime, and the class who had led it were unworthy and unfit to share in the government.

While this plan of Reconstruction was under discussion in Congress, the *Republican* favored its amendment in two respects. It urged that impartial suffrage should be directly established by the Constitution, and that there should be no disfranchisement of the ex-rebels. "The just are generous." it declared (January 23, 1867),

and urged that great allowance was to be made for the influences under which the South seceded, and that to treat secession as mere wanton crime was against reason and fact. "Senator Wilson is right," it said, a month later; "let the rebel leaders be excluded from all national offices, but let us have universal suffrage and no disfranchisement." It considered (February 11) the three vital measures to be: "Equal suffrage in the Constitution of the United States; the exclusion of the rebel leaders from office; enough troops in the South to enforce the laws." The second of these conditions the paper did not long support, or only in a limited form. Of the Reconstruction Act as it finally took shape, it declared (February 27) that the classes whom it excluded from the suffrage were the natural leaders of the South: "it is impossible that they should be permanently excluded from the positions they are fitted to occupy." When the new Congress was amending and supplementing the plan, it urged "the folly of disfranchisement" by a striking illustration (March 18):

"It would be a great help in reconstruction projects if no man favored a government for others that he would not live under himself. . . . We are strong at home because our government is built on principles precisely the opposite of those we propose to put in operation elsewhere. . . . Consider whether matters would be improved in this state by having the whole Republican party thrown out of the government. And yet the Democrats even here have ten times the knowledge, character, intelligence, and ability to make a respectable administration, that is possessed in the South by the elements that have no speck or stain of rebellion. There can be no real, no true, no lasting reconstruction in the South that does not include all classes of its people. Disfranchisement is as great folly as applied to the whites, as omission to enfranchise is wickedness toward the negroes."

So long as Congress was reshaping the details of its plan, the *Republican* continued to plead for the wider and wiser course, and argued that there should be only a few hundred excluded from office, and none from the suffrage.

It recognized equally the parallel mistake of giving the franchise to the great mass of ignorant freedmen. It pointed out (April 20) that to divide political parties at the South on the line of color — which the congressional policy insured — must be highly injurious to the weaker race. It spoke (August 7) of the infusion of an immense ignorant vote into the electoral body, as "The New Ordeal"; and urged that to push forward general education was the only resource against the mistake that had been made. The highest course of all, it declared, — the establishment of impartial but educated suffrage, — had been sacrificed to "party necessity." In this it spoke the truth. There was too much of party spirit among the congressional leaders. They identified the party which had so greatly served the country — the party too with which their personal fortunes were bound up — with the cause of the country itself. They took their measures so that their immediate end was gained; a temporary ascendency was secured for the Republican party in the South; the state governments generally came into its hands; and the electoral votes of almost all the reconstructed states were obtained for its candidates in 1868.

Yet, while freely making those criticisms on the Reconstruction scheme which the event too fully justified, the *Republican* recognized that, with whatever defects, it was the best measure attainable in the condition of Congress and the country for the restoration to the South of peace, order, and eventually the just rights of all. It

urged upon the South the hearty acceptance of the prescribed terms, and defended the Reconstruction scheme as a whole against the imputations made by the Democrats that it was unconstitutional and invalid. In truth, some of its features were quite alien to the regular mode of constitutional procedure, and had their justification only in the necessities of a revolutionary epoch. The assent of the states to a constitutional amendment, under the penalty of exclusion from self-government until they so assented, was widely foreign to all normal principles of procedure. But it was a case of "*salus populi suprema lex.*" Said the *Republican* (March 23):

"It is better for the South and the Union that the question of constitutionality should be dropped or at least postponed. Such intermission of regular procedure should be temporary and cautious. Such an experiment is more or less dangerous always, but in the present case it seemed the most direct means, if not the best, for obtaining the fundamental changes in the instrument required by the changed condition of the country. The only way for the South out of its difficulties is speedy and full acquiescence in the demands of Congress. The Union once re-established, it will be for the interest of every state and section jealously to guard the Constitution, and we believe that it is destined to stand stronger than ever for generations to come."

The paper was consistent and earnest in opposing the suspension of constitutional forms except under the most pressing necessity. Mr. Sumner proposed the establishment of impartial suffrage throughout the Union by an act of Congress. This the *Republican* opposed (May 18) as an unnecessary and unjustifiable infraction of the Constitution. It was severe in condemnation of those Northern states which still refused the suffrage to their black citizens, but declared there was no such excuse for Federal interference in those states as was furnished by the wholly exceptional condition of the South.

The *Republican* habitually supported Congress in its differences with President Johnson. It approved, not merely as a temporary measure but as permanent legislation, the Tenure-of-Office law, by which the President was forbidden to remove without the assent of the Senate any official for whose appointment a senatorial confirmation was necessary. But it deprecated the bitterness with which the quarrel was carried on. There remained in the cabinet one man who was intensely opposed to the President, and whose temper and personal characteristics would have made him under such circumstances a galling subordinate to a less irascible man than Johnson,— the war secretary, Edwin M. Stanton. The Republican leaders wanted him kept in the War-office as a check on the President. The President felt it as an injury and insult that a bitter political enemy should hold place in his own cabinet. He invited Mr. Stanton to resign, but the latter declined to do so,— wrongly, thought the *Republican* (August 8). Thereupon the President suspended him until the re-assembling of Congress, and put General Grant in his place.

"The contest between the President and Congress," said the paper, in regard to the general issue, "is not wholly wanting in earnest convictions as to principles and policy, on either side, but the means and the spirit in which the controversy is waged shame the moral sense of the country."

The victory lay wholly with Congress, and in that body and among the Republican chiefs an extreme and aggressive temper was becoming prevalent. Stevens had proposed a sweeping measure of confiscation; Sumner was urging the regulation by Congress of suffrage throughout the Union. There was a disposition in Congress to keep no terms with the President,— to drive him completely to the wall. The terms of Reconstruc-

tion had disqualified the whole class of leaders whom the Southern whites trusted and followed, and had temporarily swamped the vote of the whites by that of a densely ignorant population, just emerging from slavery. The pace had been too fast for the Northern people; the autumn elections of 1867 showed a reaction; the great states of New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio were Democratic; in other states, even in Massachusetts, there was a heavy Democratic gain.

"It means," said the *Republican*, after the October elections, "that the people are beginning to doubt both the justice and sound policy of disfranchising the white men of the South that the blacks may be dominant. The party is temporarily damaged, but the cause is not lost. Its vitality lies in the idea of equal rights for all men, and its strength and success depend upon the wisdom and fidelity with which it applies and upholds it."

The paper viewed with distrust the passionate and aggressive radicalism which ruled the party councils at Washington in the beginning of 1868. In an article (February 3) headed, "Do Revolutions ever go Backward?" it combated the tendency of Congress to usurp control of the whole government, to needlessly prolong the military administration of the South, and to forget justice and charity in its passionate partisanship. It urged (February 4) that the convictions and feelings of the Southern whites, whether wholly reasonable or not, were facts which could not safely be ignored. "There is always danger so long as the moral sense of the governed is either alienated or aggrieved."

But a rash act of the President brought the issue between him and Congress to the extreme test. Secretary Stanton had resumed office on the assembling of Congress, and under the construction given by that body

to the Tenure-of-Office law,—that it was applicable to members of the cabinet,—there was no relief for the President from this thorn in the side. Suddenly, acting on the ground that such an enactment was unconstitutional and of no force, he addressed to Stanton an order of removal from his office, and appointed General Lorenzo Thomas his *ad interim* successor. Congress was thrown into a fever of excitement, which communicated itself to the country as fast as the wires could carry their message. The Senate declared Stanton's removal illegal, and he remained in peaceful possession of the War-office. On the same day (Feb. 21) the House passed a vote looking to the impeachment of the President. Three days later, by a strict party vote, 128 to 47, a formal resolution of impeachment was adopted. Articles were framed in which the chief allegation was the defiance of law in the attempt to supersede Stanton, and a principal further charge was the language of the President's speeches in which he had spoken of Congress with opprobrium and charged it with usurpations. The House appointed as managers of the impeachment Messrs. Bingham, Boutwell, Wilson, Butler, Williams, Logan, and Stevens. The President's counsel were Messrs. Curtis, Evarts, Groesbeck, Nelson, and Stanbery. Chief-justice Chase presided over the Senate, sitting as a court to try the impeachment. The trial lasted from March 30th to May 26th.

The *Republican*, which had been wholly unfavorable to all previous schemes of impeachment, gave its approval to the measure when the President undertook to seize the War-office. As the trial advanced, it maintained a moderate, good-tempered tone, while the storm of party feeling was at its highest. It held that the conviction and removal of the President would be just and wise, but it recognized always the absolute moral competence and obligation of senators to act as judges and

vote according to their individual convictions. It said (May 12) that the power of the presidential office had become excessive and might be dangerously increased were Johnson acquitted; and rejected the suggestion that his conviction might tend toward making impeachment thereafter the ready resource of a congressional majority; while it still considered that neither conviction nor acquittal was likely to work deep mischief to the country. Of the President it said at the climax of the trial (May 18):

"He was guilty. He deserved conviction. The nation needed it. The largest and best considerations of statesmanship required it. The spirit of the law and the Constitution demanded it. And as a practical thing, notwithstanding the many and serious objections against it, the country would have been better for it."

In the House, impeachment had been dealt with on strict party lines. Should the same temper govern the Senate, the conviction of the President was a foregone conclusion, for more than the requisite two-thirds of that body were Republican. In theory, the senators sitting as a Court of Impeachment were bound to judicial impartiality, regardful only of justice, the law, and the evidence. The popular logic of the hour was, that no Republican — in other words, no patriot — could honestly doubt the legal and moral guilt of the President. As the decisive vote drew near, the rumor spread that several Republican senators were likely to vote for acquittal — enough, even, to render the result doubtful. The gale of party feeling swelled to a hurricane. The name of traitor was given to any Republican who should vote to acquit. Few were the voices heard from the dominant party for the senatorial right and duty of impartial judgment. Among those few, clear and strong,

was the voice of the *Republican*. It protested energetically against the assumption that the judges in the nation's extraordinary and highest court were bound to think with the majority of their party associates. The test vote was reached on the 16th of May. Fifty-four votes being cast, and thirty-six needed to convict, the result was declared,— to convict, thirty-five; to acquit, nineteen. Impeachment had failed.

Of the votes given for acquittal seven were cast by Republican senators,—Fessenden, Fowler, Grimes, Henderson, Ross, Trumbull, and Van Winkle. The bitter wrath of their party associates came upon them. Scarcely any language of denunciation was too strong for partisan speakers and newspapers. The violence of condemnation passed with time, the imputations of bribery or base motive were but the passing passion of the hour; yet the act was not condoned by their old associates, and it may be said with substantial truth that these votes were the political ruin of almost every one of the seven.

The *Republican* was very hearty in defending these men, and vindicating the right of independent judgment which they had exercised. Through the whole of the trial, it displayed at their best its qualities of fairness, broad judgment, and buoyant courage. The paper never did better service than when in the flurries and spasms of political excitement it kept its head, and its cheerful confidence that the Republic was safe,—that the shock of the moment "was of the wave and not the rock." That it was never swayed by the popular breeze of the time it would be idle to assert. To the bias of the passing time rather than to sound judgment is to be attributed its support of Johnson's conviction. Viewed at the distance of half a generation, it seems clear that his attempted removal of Stanton,— unjustifiable, and in effect promptly thwarted,—yet, considering the constitu-

tional irregularities of the time, did not merit the penalty of deposition from the Presidency; and still less did his denunciatory talk against Congress deserve so heavy a punishment. No harm came to the nation from his subsequent acts in office, and time cleared him from the imputation of willful usurpation. His acquittal was recognized as entitling him to get rid of the obnoxious secretary of war; and Stanton gave place to Schofield,—with no injury to the war department or the country. That swelling tide of extreme and bitter partisanship, which the *Republican* had opposed just before the impeachment, the tendency represented by men like Stevens and Butler and Logan, would have won by the President's removal, and Senator Wade's succession to his place, a triumph perhaps dangerous in itself and dangerous in the reaction against it. Certain it is that there was great moral gain to the nation in the example set by the seven senators, of the judge rising above the partisan,—an example most necessary at that time, and most striking in its contrast with the partisanship which marked the next extraordinary tribunal of the nation, the Electoral Commission of 1876.

The Republican National Convention met at Chicago, immediately after the close of the impeachment trial. There was no question as to who should be its nominee for the Presidency. All eyes turned to General Grant, commander of the victorious Union armies, magnanimous to the conquered foe; the friend of Congress in its dispute with the President, but not entangled with faction or intrigue; a strong, silent, massive figure, standing out above the crowd of noisy politicians; representative of triumph won, and of peace to follow,—proved as a military administrator, trusted as a patriot, relied on by the people amid civic tumult as his soldiers had relied on him in the struggle in the Wilderness. Six months

before (November 11, 1867), the *Republican* had given its reasons "Why the people look to General Grant":

"He has led them to final victory over the rebellion; they look to him to lead in the equally essential work of allaying animosities and restoring unity and fraternity among the people, reëstablishing the reign of civil law, and bringing order and peace out of the present confusion."

Upon his nomination it said (May 22):

"Let them that can, pronounce a name more dear or more renowned! The loyalty, the courage, the suffering, and the triumph of the nation, are in that one word. . . . It was not solely nor chiefly because he could 'run' well, that his name was first mentioned and received with enthusiasm by all classes throughout the country. It was because of a general sentiment that precisely this man was needed to secure the full and final reconstruction of the South, to inaugurate a thorough and searching retrenchment in the expenses of government, to introduce into the civil service the same high standard with which his military selections have ever been made, and to give the nation the spectacle of a president free from slavery to party ties, indifferent to reëlection, and exerting his immense patronage not to degrade but to elevate our politics."

The convention which nominated General Grant, and with him Schuyler Colfax for Vice-President, expressed the nobler temper and broader mind of the Republican party. Its resolutions approved the congressional policy of reconstruction, and condemned the President as worthy of removal. But the demand for censure on the seven dissenting senators was rejected by the convention. Their condemnation was left to find its official expression in the report to the House of its impeachment managers, written by Butler, of whom the *Republican* said, "No man ever came so near reducing the violation of the ninth commandment to a science." The convention, on

motion of Carl Schurz, adopted an additional resolution approving the welcome back into full fraternity of all former rebels now become loyal to the government and to equal rights, and calling for the removal of all political disabilities as fast as the public safety would allow. The platform approved the extension of the voting franchise to the emancipated blacks, but declared that the question of suffrage in the loyal states belonged to the people of those states. It needed one more victory to bring the party up to the level of the Fifteenth Amendment.

The Democrats met in convention in New York a month later. Mr. Bowles, writing on the spot, thus characterized the significance of the occasion (July 7):

"There is something more in the struggles here than the mere personal ambition of men for office and of a party for power. There is first a patriotic belief that the country is in bad hands; and that, as Mr. Chase expresses it in one of the many letters that he is writing hither, four years more of such men as are dominating Congress — meaning of course the Thad Stevens and Ben Butler and John Logan wing of the Republicans — will leave us little of nationality and republicanism worth preserving. Then besides this there is the contest within the party between its best and its worst elements, the representatives of a new era and of a future, and the exponents of the copperheadism of the war and the traditions and issues of the past; between in a certain sense men of honor and culture and growth, and men of brutality and ignorant instinct and coarse passion; between an honest paying of our debts and repudiation; between the 'Brick Pomeroys' and the Peter Harveys and Judge Abbotts; between the dregs of the old Democracy after the pure wine had been drawn off by anti-slavery and the war, and the aristocracy of wealth and culture that have come to it through the old Whig party and the conservatism of command. Mr. Chase represents one side, Mr. Pendleton the other — the other candidates are compromisers and go-betweens.

"This, the true view of the contest here, gives it an interest for all reflective men, and lifts it above a mere struggle for

patronage and power; and it enlists, as it should, on the side of Mr. Chase's nomination, all true and independent men of the Republican party, all who care more for the good of the country than the mere success of a party."

With this struggle of ideas there blent a conflict of personal ambitions. Judge Chase, a prominent leader of the Free-soilers and then of the Republicans; a rival of Lincoln's for the Presidency; his able minister of finance, and by him appointed to the chief-justiceship,— was again eagerly seeking the Presidency. He was well understood, during the impeachment trial over which he presided, to be on the side of President Johnson. His candidacy as a Democrat offered the party the possible gain of some Republican votes. The convention just missed nominating him. An obscure intrigue, or the accident of a few critical minutes such as serve to decide a battle, led the delegates into what seemed a spontaneous enthusiastic declaration for Horatio Seymour, who presided over their assembly and had declared in the strongest terms that he would not take the nomination. Frank P. Blair was nominated for Vice-President. Seymour was an able civilian, of broad culture, and administrative experience. His subsequent letter of acceptance— unlike Blair's—was not extreme in its general tone, but his expressed acquiescence in the platform identified him with the sentiment and purpose of the body that adopted it. The convention left no doubt as to what that sentiment was. Its resolutions, recognizing the overthrow of secession and slavery as accomplished facts, but with no pretense of gratification at this result, denounced in unmeasured language the whole course of Congress; declared the Reconstruction acts to be "usurpations and unconstitutional, revolutionary and void"; favored the taxation of government bonds — against express stipulations;— and declared that should a Republican president

be elected in November, "we will meet as a subjected and conquered people, amid the ruins of liberty and the scattered fragments of the Constitution." The convention was swayed by that Southern element which accepted no result of the war beyond the overthrow of the Confederacy, and by the Northern sympathizers with that element. In its tumultuous cheering the loudest note was "the rebel yell" which had answered the Northern hurrah when the opposing lines charged on the battle-field. Said the *Republican* (July 8):

"The worst dogmas of the worst section of the party have been accepted by the conservatives. Repudiation and revolution are its watchwords. The convention has been deaf to the invitations of the time, false to the instincts and logic of its wisest men, blind through the bitter partisanships of the war to the opportunities of peace. It has erred as Congress has erred, in carrying into a new era the animosities and dispositions of an old. The Republican party has seen its mistakes and will soonest act upon them. Chicago was wiser than Washington. New York was not. Vallandigham, the Jonah of the Democratic party from '61 to '66, is still its prophet, still its ruler, still its grave-digger. He has been its leading spirit here this week, and he leads it again to defeat."

Of that defeat there could indeed be no doubt. Congress from 1865 to 1868 had embodied in legislation the logical results of the war. The work was rough and faulty in some particulars, but the practical question was now between its substantial acceptance and the re-opening of a political strife as fundamental as that which had issued in civil war. The country was in no mood for such strife. Grant's words, "Let us have peace!" were the key-note of the popular temper. All of the old free states voted for Grant and Colfax except New York, New Jersey, and Oregon. So also did Missouri, while the other border states, Delaware, Maryland, and Kentucky, voted for

Seymour and Blair. The new constituencies of the reconstructed states were Republican, except in Georgia and Louisiana. Texas, Virginia, and Mississippi had not been rehabilitated, and cast no electoral vote. In the electoral college the votes stood 214 to 80; at the polls, about 3,000,000 to 2,700,000. In the new House the Republicans had a majority of almost ninety. Reconstruction in its main lines was irreversibly established.

Grave questions still presented themselves. There were already ominous signs that the new order of things as regarded the negroes would not everywhere be peaceably accepted. The abuse and intimidation of the blacks by the night-riders of the "Kuklux" had already begun. On the other hand the permanent exclusion from the suffrage of the leading classes in Southern society — of the men who had hitherto been its congressmen, legislators, and magistrates in peace, and its commanders in war — was manifestly an element of instability in the settlement. The black voters came largely under the control of native whites of inferior character, and of men from the North who as a class, with some honorable exceptions, were political adventurers. The state governments administered by such elements were deeply infected with incompetence and corruption. In other respects the congressional plan had worked fairly well. The temporary rule of military commanders had been just and moderate. Most of the Southern population, both white and black, bore themselves well under the ordeal of their new situation. Both races had undergone a sudden and immense transition. The blacks had passed, almost at one stroke, from chattels into citizens and voters. The whites had endured impoverishment and conquest, and, in place of fighting for their independence, were now under the political domination of their former slaves. That there was, on the whole, so little of excess on either side, that

patience and sobriety were the general rule, was to the highest credit of both races.

With Grant's administration there opened a new era, in which the Southern question was no longer the one absorbing issue. The critical stage of Reconstruction was past. The course of the Springfield *Republican* during the period from 1865 to 1868 is an illustration of fidelity to the best characteristic principles of a party, united with free and serviceable criticism of party faults. The true theory of independent journalism was exemplified by it in these years as faithfully, though not at such cost, as in the Greeley revolt of 1872.

Its distinctive ideas were vindicated by time. It was in the way it had advocated, by a constitutional amendment, that manhood suffrage was at last made universal, and the reproach removed from the North of denying to its own meager black population the franchise it enforced for the great mass of Southern freedmen. The failure to affix an educational qualification bequeathed that difficulty of a vast ignorant suffrage under which the South now staggers. The paper's prediction that the color line in politics would work disaster to the blacks was amply fulfilled. The disfranchisement of the Southern leaders helped to consolidate them and the body of intelligent whites into permanent opposition to the party which embodied the best intelligence of the North. It was the gradual piecemeal removal of that disqualification which brought the leaders of the rebellion into the active duties of loyal citizenship. But the difficulties of the Reconstruction problem were so vast that the men who worked out its practical solution are not to be too harshly judged at the points where they failed. The passions and prejudices of both sections were among the main facts they had to deal with. It was not in human nature that the late master class should at once heartily recognize the

civil manhood of the freedmen, and it was their unwillingness to do this which reconciled the Northern people, though with fears and misgivings, to giving the black man the ballot as a political weapon of defense. On the other hand, it was too much to expect that the Northern people should at once recognize that the leaders of the cause they had been fighting and hating with all their might were to be welcomed back into full equality in the government. Few were wise enough to instantly see this except those rare souls who are great enough to fight without hating. Greeley and Andrew saw it,— so did a few others; but it is doubtful whether Lincoln himself could have successfully taught that lesson to the Northern people as a whole. But a leadership like Lincoln's would have avoided the chief mistake of the Republican congressmen,—the attempt to secure the party's ascendency by bringing in the solid black vote of the South. That was the consideration which defeated the educational test. A suffrage so limited would have failed to yield the majorities requisite to control the Southern states for the Republicans. From this short-sighted and selfish mistake dated the worst political troubles of the ensuing years. It was an instance of what had now become the chief danger in national affairs. For many years the crying evil had been slavery,— now, it was party spirit.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Letters: 1865–1868.

To Charles Allen.

November 23, 1865.

. . . My letters ["Across the Continent"] are all in type. Now I am on supplementary papers, and I am taking several pages from your letters. . . . Webster has it *transhipped* and *fullness*, and so the book. Don't you hope to deprave us up here with your ancient spelling! "Unkempt" I used in the broader sense that is coming over it, of slouching and untidy; but I alter that; and I put the quotation into verse and in full. But I can't give up "aboundingness." I know it is new, but it fits, and "abundance" doesn't. I am rather reckless and democratic in my use of the king's English, you see; but nevertheless I am ever so much obliged to you for your hints, and I have adopted enough to show my appreciation and humility, and rejected enough to prove my independence! You see I am not learned in grammar, syntax, and prosody; my ear and my habit are my only guides. What can you expect of a fellow who left school at sixteen, and hasn't read anything but newspapers ever since?

January 17, 1866.

. . . The *Nation's* notice was certainly all I could expect; its praise was very generous and complete; and its criticism only exaggerates, it seems to me, faults that I of course knew were there, that are inseparable from my style. I don't think it is so bad in those respects as the *Nation's* notice would indicate, but may be it is. I was prepared for this sort of judgment

by your warning, and yet I don't regret that I declined to "pad and powder" the letters. I should have had to depend upon somebody else really to have done it; and it was more honest and fair to let it all stand, correcting of course such obvious errors as my revision and your suggestions have discovered. The book made itself; it is a newspaper book; I am a newspaper writer, and not a book writer; and I don't aspire to be other than I am. Perhaps I ought to feel different, but this seems more consistent with my self-respect and consistency.

Your own tribute to the book, Charles, is rather stunning. It rather tries my faith in your independent, impartial judgment, for which I have had great respect heretofore. We shall have to put something down to a pretty warm and affectionate friendship, but there is enough left to make me proud and grateful too. There is surely no one's good opinion of the book that is so agreeable to me as yours, or that would so make of small account what anybody else may find to say about it. Mrs. B. approves of what you say, entirely — except the exceptions!

If you should be minded to come up and spend Sunday, don't refrain from any delicate notions, or because I have got some new claret, and there is a bottle of Steinberger left!

April, 1866.

. . . California gets madder and madder, the more it thinks about it, at my views of women; which I greatly enjoy, except so far as it involves those whom I met, and from whom I received kind courtesies. But the charges of ingratitude and provincialism I don't like. Those two are not weaknesses of mine, and I am not ashamed to be sensitive. However my chief concern (!) is of course to sell the book now, and this all may be made to help — only there should be discussion to keep the world astir. I have arranged for some out in California!

I have a long letter from Ralston, Bank of California, for you to read. . . . I have been quite ill this week, lame and bilious and miserable, but shall get worse or better — I hardly can tell which — to-day.

Mr. Seward has just appointed the *Republican* to print the United States Laws, but the *Republican* declines. Let alone the disgrace of the thing, it doesn't pay the printer for type and white paper. But come up, and we will go on to prove to each other how virtuous we all are.

To Miss Whitney, in California. .

April 12, 1866.

We tarried in New York till Monday of this week, staying at Dr. Barker's most of the time. On the whole it was quite pleasant and useful. It is difficult in looking back to see we did much; judged by ordinary people's visiting and sight-seeing for a week, it was all very paltry; but we had some new sensations. Mary had time to be sick and get well, to get rest and new thought, and thinks she had a very good time indeed. To me the week was most memorable by marking greater steadiness of nerve, more power of endurance, and more universal cheeriness of disposition. I did not mount my great heights of abandon; perhaps it is better described in your own sad words as a "*wise despair.*" It is the forty year old fate of most people of any capacity for experience and any experience. Let us be content and cheerful (as we can) that it is no worse. Margaret Fuller said sadly: "I used to think I could conquer the world; now I see it was vain, idle." So Frothingham made the text of his sad discourse last Sunday (wherein he was bitter and severe on the Unitarian Conference, and not hopeful — not expectant perhaps is better — as to public affairs) the idea that things never turn out as well as we anticipate, as we strive to have them; and his moral was to hope for everything and to expect nothing. It was a very sad, bitter, and bilious sermon, but yet very strong and pungent. He had expected much of the Conference; he had asked for bread, and he felt he has got a stone. Well, this is off the track. Sunday night we went over and took tea with the Storrses, and to hear Beecher, which we did without satisfaction,—he was feverish, and we weary and in a crowd; then we went back and spent the night. Next forenoon we had the George Bliss carriage and horses to ourselves, and "did" Central Park in

most aristocratic style, under a soft spring sky. After that, to Dr. Barker's. The Conference occupied parts of several days for us both. You have my letters about it. There were various views to be taken of it; perhaps I have been contemptuous, but it all seemed very contemptible and ridiculous from the *Republican* standpoint; and it was all a great trial and disappointment to the radicals, to Mr. Frothingham, Mrs. McKay, and such.— I am getting very much disciplined for my letters, however, by my conservative Unitarian friends. They are very much grieved — but their Orthodox friends were before them — at the freedom and irreverence of the *Republican's* pens. I spent part of another day in Brooklyn, calling on relatives and acquaintances, and dining with the Storrses, who had Beecher for my delectation. He was uncommonly bright and pungent, and we had a feast of fat things. He has no reverence, and he inspires none, only wonder and admiration for his mental gymnastics and his physical freshness and vigor.

To General John Pierce, of Colorado.

June 7, 1866.

Your long and good letter from Batavia has upbraided me with its unacknowledged but not unappreciated tenderness for many weeks. But you know how full my life has been and is, and how small, after all, my power; and I am sure you have not misinterpreted my silence. Since I went to Washington, and until within ten days, I have been quite under the weather, and I have had to neglect everything. It is very dear to me to find my cordial and even affectionate regard for you so sweetly responded to — to feel that we alike have the subtle, magnetic attraction for one another.— But I smiled at what you say about my young ambition. That is over and gone with me. I have been hard at work since fifteen, and am exhausted. I seek no new worlds to conquer. I am content to hold my own, to cultivate the little field that I have made, to be worthy of the esteem and love that are given me by my family and friends, and so far as possible repay all their generous kindness of thought and action to me. This is my highest ambition now. And yours I can see is not unlike to it. Our temperaments

and our training are different, but each in his own way has come round to the same thing at last.

I wish you could see our home now. It is looking so fresh and green and beautiful. I fancy you and your wife on our piazza after tea — you smoking a pipe of peace and uttering calm and wise philosophies, as becomes a gray-haired old man (!) and I listening as the disciples of Plato listened in the Athenian groves! Aye, you must come back some sweet June and let us realize the thought — it is too pleasant not to take form in actuality.

Your letter to the *Republican* is a distinguished success. It is just what I want. Send us "sich" occasionally — at least four or five a year. And the concern will be indebted to you $5 worth for each. Small pay, I know, but our standard for best letters — and then consider the benefits to an ignorant world!

. . . Wife and children all join me in heartiest and most affectionate remembrances to Mrs. Pierce and yourself. Let me be commended also to Cass, and Rogers and wife, and all other good men and women who haven't forgotten Sam Bowles. But on you I depend first of all to keep my memory green under the shadows of the Rocky Mountains till I come again, as I mean to, and conquer your love anew. . . . And so, at last, but not forever, good-bye. God bless you!

To Miss Whitney.

June 8, 1866.

You give me more vivid idea of the stir my chapter on Society has made in San Francisco than anybody else had given me; though what Sydney Smith called "flashes of silence," and occasional intimations from various sources, taught me how mistakenly some people looked at it, and how indignantly others. For myself, I rather enjoy it, — that's the kind of "row" I am not adverse to kindling. I know I am right, — philosophically, literally, logically right, — and that my views will be responded to by all candid, thoughtful observers. But I am annoyed that any of the return fire should come on you, ever so lightly. I wish Mrs. ——— would write

me — I should like the privilege of answering any formal complainings on that score. The *News Letter* didn't send me the number that contained its promised review of my "slanders," though carefully sending all each side of it. Can't you get it for me? I am curious to see it all. In fact, judging from letters and newspapers, my book has had but poor welcome in California, though I do believe its writing and publication is the best little thing that has happened to that country for years, by disseminating knowledge of its wonders, charms, and capabilities,— its best literary advertisement extant. I have seen only two *(Bulletin* and *Union)* kind, appreciative newspaper notices. I do not mention this complainingly, nor would I speak of it at all to another than you. The welcome and praise of the book have been on the whole most unexpected and generous, — beyond all measure of desert or desire. I should be the last person to complain of fortune or life or the world. As to an ill reception in California should I go again,— as I hope I may, but probably never shall,— I know the world better than to fear any neglect or ill treatment. I should be only too well treated. Before, save from a half-dozen, I only took the fragments of bounty measured out to more distinguished people. I was the tail end of a public party, with no individuality, receiving no personal attention, and feeling no sense of personal responsibility or obligation. Going now it would be very different, because now I have earned a distinctive name among the people. A few might ignore and snub me — they would be just those I should not care for; but all of those for whose regard or respect I should care — and they are many— would give me all the greeting I could, in vainest moments, crave. And all the more because I was independent and critical and even sharp before.— But this is of no consequence; only don't you believe your friend would suffer martyrdom or go hungry and houseless, should he visit California again. I know California human nature too well for that; by the very token of its present ill nature would it be civil, and possibly fawning, again. We are rarely treated according to our merits in this world, you know. And I know I get more than I deserve, all around and constantly.

In October, 1866, he spent a week in the coal and iron regions of Pennsylvania, with an excursion party which included Hugh McCullough,— Johnson's able Secretary of the Treasury,— David A. Wells, and many members of Congress; the object being the study of questions of taxation. The trip produced a series of letters to the *Republican*, from which two or three characteristic passages may be given. Of the scenery in Carbon and Schuylkill counties he writes:

"The landscape was everywhere grand and beautiful. Open and generous hills on all sides; long, wide vistas stretched before the eye in every direction; out through deep gaps the Delaware ran wide, and Philadelphia lay beyond with its crowds in the imagination; all things were on a majestic scale,— nature was grand and broad and beautiful,— human activity was daring, rapid, impressive in its undertakings and its triumphs. The full wooded hill-sides along which our pathway mostly ran, first on one side of the valley and then on the opposite, were now all red and gold with the autumn ripeness. Such extent and wealth of color are rarely to be seen in other states. The vision is narrower in New England; the hills and the trees are fewer elsewhere. Here it seems boundless,— the eye wanders and wades in color through long, long distances, and rests at last in a confused, rich, intoxicating mass of glow. It was one long delirium of beauty, filling up and choking the soul of sense; another and sweeter and subtler shape of that fullness and ripeness and tropical reverie of sense that comes with hasheesh, or waits on the presence of highest human beauty, or painter's most sympathetic creation."

Here is a different picture from Pittsburg:

"It is a hot and hellish place, these furnaces and foundries, spreading over acres of ground. The blood warms and the perspiration flows and the nerves summon their reserves, as we walk around and watch the huge dripping chunks of yellow-white iron come from the puddling furnaces, trundle quickly across the floor, and tumble into a grinding or rather com-

pressing wheel that gathers it in hungry jaws, spouts streams of cold water upon it, and sets it going around and around, giving it an irresistible giant hugging, in which the red and tender mass often sends forth shrieks like the cannon's fire, and scatters its sputtering fragments for rods around."

"The scenery of the Alleghanies," he writes, "unites beauty and grandeur, picturesqueness and breadth, sweep of hill and width of valley, the solitude of nature and the improvement of art, accessibility and comfort of travel, as no other mountain section does on the continent. I wonder we New Englanders have not more thoroughly found it out and enjoyed it."

The last letter discusses the economical questions for the study of which the excursion was made.

"We discussed tariff and currency and turkey and champagne with the Pittsburg iron and steel lords in the evening. The harmonious, even enthusiastic agreement on the two latter themes argued well for the property and perpetuity of the Republic, while it surely mitigated the shocks of difference as to the other topics."

As to those topics his own conclusions are in substance that Pennsylvania ought to aid New England to reduce and reform the currency (the gold dollar at this date comparing with the paper dollar as 141½ to 100); and New England in turn should aid Pennsylvania to secure a lightening of internal revenue taxes, and a temporary addition to taxes on imports, to steady the markets while the currency is getting back to its normal basis.

"The chief evil of our condition, which Pennsylvania is slow to see through the blinding influence of her great prosperity in 1863–4, lies in the debauched and inflated condition of our currency, producing a fickle and fanciful state of feeling and prices in all the business world. We have lost the standard of value; gold is at one price, labor and goods at other and very different prices; we float on a sea of paper money, at the mercy of speculation, rumors, alarms; plucked by foreigners, swindled

by each other; — there is no escape but in turning back and going ashore and treading the earth firmly under our feet again."

These last sentences give the characteristic tone of the *Republican* on financial questions. The paper's own success had its basis in close, careful, intelligent economy. It strove for a like economy in the community's affairs all through the period of public and private extravagance and inflation which lasted for nearly a decade after the war.

To John Pierce.

March 10, 1867.

Dear old Pierce: Did you write me you were going to lose your d——d old office just to *harry* up my feelings, or to set me at work? If the latter, why did you not tell me something more; why and who, etc.; whether you were a good officer, or had stolen, or divided the profits with —— or some other blatherskite of a member of Congress? How should I know how to work on the feelings of A. Johnson, alderman, etc., in your behalf, without *fax* to aver or deny? Don't you see and weep? Anyhow I have gone and wrote a tremendous epistle to Washington town, full of indignation as to your virtues. Confound 'em, they'd think, if they believe me, that the Rocky Mountains will upheave and turn somerset, if they touch a hair of your gray old head. Well, much good may it do you, old fellow. It is the only thing I have asked of this cussed administration, and A. Johnson and his gang have pretended to be sweet on us because we have not insisted that they should be hung and quartered until they had had a chance to pray and put on clean clothes.

Your letter about the *Ingin* is good. Don't I want to go to the Mountains this next summer? Will S—— be there to appreciate those hills with me? Did the people of this office send you a small check in January? And do you remember still in your regards and prayers,

Yours, ever faithfully —

September 8, 1867.

We were glad to hear again from you; to have good reports of health and happiness; and to find your hearts still warmed toward this nook and corner of the "great land," and us "poor lambs" in the great flock.

The summer has brought little new to us,—except a pair of ponies, that the children can ride, and all of us drive. Mrs. Bowles and I have been at home nearly all the season. We tried a few days in the White Mountains, but she was ill there most of the time, and we have been singing since, "There is no place like home." The children have been wandering some,—the older ones making a visit in Geneva, N. Y., and the younger ones are staying up on the hills at Blandford. Our season has been very wet and cold,—rarely so; and though it has given rich and abundant foliage, it has ripened disease as well.

Thanks for the information about the mine. You hit my own notions about the matter. I hope it will win, for then I shall make some money, and when you come East you shall have twenty-cent cigars and the highest priced whisky. If it don't,—then you must take up with common tobacco and a keener corn-juice. The welcome shall always be the same,—like religion, without money and without price.

The Indians and Mrs. Bowles's health broke up my hopes of the mountains this season. I keep them, however, as bright anticipation for next year. Life is so crowded with me, it is difficult to say what I can do, or will do,—but I know what I want to do,—and chief of the wants is a new trip to your mountains, and the sight of you and your wife under the shadows of those snowy hills.

Colfax has got the White House on the brain. Too bad. He is too good a fellow to go daft on that subject. And yet, aside from Gen. Grant, there is no one whose claim is so good. But so far as mortal ken can decide, Grant will take the game at a swoop.

Keep us warm in your memory, and posted as to your lives.

To Miss Whitney.

WASHINGTON.

[In the winter or early spring of 1868.]

I set apart an hour for you yesterday, but it was stolen, and to-day I am not so cheerful. . . . Sunday night (in New York) I called and took tea with the Fields, and also called at Godkin's. Monday was wet and cold, and I gave the morning to "John Paul," and then went down town and saw Mr. Bond, Mr. Raymond, and Mr. Dana, and dined with the latter two in the evening, not being able to get a ticket to the farewell reading of Dickens. Tuesday I came on here, but was ill all day and homesick. Wednesday night I dined with Colfax, who taught me to play *Bezique*, which is really unique and fascinating. We should have learned it as a change or substitute to eucher, and you must now. Last night I dined at Mr. Hooper's with Mr. Sumner. To-night with Mr. Dawes, and afterward to a party at Senator Pomeroy's for Mr. Tilton, who is here and there. Most of the days I have spent at the Capitol, hearing speeches on Impeachment, and seeing public men, and getting my usual disgust of politics and political life. The wrong-doing, the jealousies and mistrust, the pettiness of the men "set over us," are so sad and so deep that one despairs of the Republic. The place of honor is the "private station," and only deep and broad faith gives confidence in our institutions — their perpetuity and their progress. And as for woman suffrage, there is and can be no hope for it so long as there is so much trimming on their dresses as now, and the best women yield to the absurdities of fashion, and give up the best part of their souls and their strength to their preparation and their display. There must be reform and independence here; women must feel and prove that simplicity and beauty are not antagonists but friends, ere we can hope to see the calling of the women up higher and their advancement to their true and natural equality in life, society, and government. This thought has greatly impressed me these last few days as I have seen the extent and extravagance of the new fashions of ladies' costumes.

. . . Mr. Olmsted's report on Park Streets is worth your reading. He writes hard, and it reads hard, but there is meat

in his thought. Such streets as he proposes — wide and shady, with flowers and trees and drive-ways and horseback paths — ought to be, must be, introduced into the suburbs of towns as well as cities. All the outgoing roads of Northampton and Springfield should be thus reconstructed. They are the true substitutes for parks, which we have not money enough to build and keep up, or population enough to improve and enjoy. But a park roading of 200 or 300 feet wide, from Northampton to Florence and up to Hatfield; from Springfield to Longmeadow and to Chicopee,— what treasures they would be,— and they would more than pay all cost in the increased value of adjoining lands. Then we should get park luxuries and enjoyments as we drive in our business, etc. This is an old and favorite idea of mine, but I suspect I borrowed it from Olmsted. O.'s style of writing must have changed, or I can't understand the popularity of his books. It is very hard work to read him now,— he is so formal and stiff in his style.

To H. L. Dawes.

June 3, 1868.

Do make a strong economy and anti-corruption speech! Do, do, for your own sake, your country's, your party's. Congress is far behind the country in this.

I am going to recommend the Hampden County candidates to join in a letter to you asking you to continue in Congress.*

To his Wife.

Denver, Colorado, September 6, 1868.

Just back from the mountains, weary but well; with all sorts of rare experiences, joy, pain, comfort, discomfort, each in rich variety; I riding muleback all the time — twenty to thirty miles a day; no time or strength to write; every day full of fatigue with riding and camp-work — too full — and no post-office to mail letters at, if written; an Indian scare, and a change of route, and a hurried journey back to town, to escape chance of danger; all vivid, enlivening, and strengthening,— the details

* Mr. Dawes now represented a district which along with Berkshire County comprised southern Hampden, including Springfield.

whereof cannot now be written, for we are busy in getting ready to move homeward. It has been rather rough and too hurried, but I have borne it all very well, and gained strength all the time; was very sick one night, but got better right away; and am now just in the condition and mood for another month of saddle and camp life. And, in fact, I should stay and have it, going off to-morrow with Governor Hunt into the South, could I feel justified in staying away from home so long. Nothing would seem to be better for me than a month or two more of this open-air life, and I dearly wish you were here, so I could stay and you could share the benefits of this dry, high air. If it was not such a long journey hither, I would bring you right back and stay till November. But you must go away as soon as we get home, and make a serious business of getting well. Life is pretty hard for us both in such ill health. What say you for October,— Blandford, New York, Saratoga? And then, if that does not set you up, we will try a longer and further-away residence.

. . . I want to journey easily, and get rested, and gain the benefit of our mountain experiences somewhat, before getting home,—also, to have Sallie see what she can of Western life and scenery now she is here. But if our news from you demands it, we shall move quicker, and be home several days earlier than the 19th. . .

I pray for improved health and strength for both of us, for thereby hangs all, or nearly all, that life has to give us of rest and peace and pleasure.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Lights and Shadows.

THE growth of Mr. Bowles's nature for a certain period following his loss of health — say in the years from 1860 to 1865 — was especially marked by richness and ideality of sentiment. His personal letters during that time show how under the pressure of weakness and suffering he ripened in sympathy and tenderness and aspiration. In the later years of his life, his most apparent development was perhaps in broad and philosophic thought. That development showed itself in the pages of the *Republican*, partly in his own writing and still more in the whole scope and tone of the paper. He handled large social questions with a wider grasp and finer insight than ever before. He did much of his work through others. He made a newspaper which far transcended in power and influence the possibilities of any single pen. He allied with himself men of large mental resource; he trained young men in his methods, infused into them his spirit, and developed the best personal traits of each. The *Republican* grew into a place of leadership on the many social questions which summoned the energies of the young nation, no longer concentrated on the single issue of slavery. It was swift to discern the real question of to-day, and to forecast the question of to-morrow. The latest advance in literature, in science, in

theology, was quickly given to its readers. The vast and complex tide of the higher civilization,— not merely the external pageant of wars and dynasties and elections, but the inner forces and tendencies, the thought of the scholar in his closet, the economics of the laborer's household, the needs of the pauper and the criminal, the fancies of the poet, the aspiration of the saint,— all were caught and reflected in the pages of the *Republican*. As a newspaper, it gave faithful narration of the good and the ill, while as a leader of opinion it helped forward all that was good.

This was the work into which Mr. Bowles poured the best energies of his later as of his earlier life. Such work has its great reward, and exacts its heavy price. For him, a part of that price was the forfeit of health. Other penalties mingled with this. It is scarcely possible to combine a life of incessant and strenuous outward activities with a life of deep serenity and joy. The stream which as it dashes downward turns a hundred mill-wheels, cannot share the peace of the still pool whose surface mirrors the mountains and the stars.

In some of the more personal letters of these later years, the ear catches an undertone of sadness. Below the courage and cheer there is often a somber strain. The power of enjoyment was not lost. When unclouded by physical suffering, his personality gave stimulus, enjoyment, life, by its mere contact. But on his inner life there often lay heavy shadows. He was too brave to make complaint, but face and bearing and rare words of self-disclosure gave glimpses of some unsatisfied void. There was a sense of frustration and disappointment,— the tantalization of some unreached and longed-for good. He was successful far beyond the majority of men. His paper never ceased to grow in excellence and influence. His life was rich in affections and friendships. But as

years went on there grew something of dejection in the attitude and of wistfulness in the look; something of deep heart-hunger is to be read here and there between the lines of his letters.

The sense of disappointment and frustration had doubtless one immediate source in the effect of an overtaxed nervous system upon the mind. He kept himself always under the spur,— the spur either of work or of social intercourse. Almost his only rest was to go away from his newspaper, and mingle with people in a constant give and take. In physical stimulants he never indulged to excess, but his mental diet was one of perpetual stimulants. The excess was in one sense ruinous. It did not destroy his power of work, but it robbed him of life's sweetest gift — peace.

The ever-present fact of his later years was a tired body and brain. That alone is enough to cast a perpetual shadow on the brightest lot. The degree to which he triumphed over his suffering is amazing. The work he accomplished, the cheer he imparted, the thought and labor and love which his life yielded, would have been a brilliant success for a well and strong man. For a disabled and suffering man it was extraordinary. Whatever mingled with it of failure at any point is entitled to a judgment in which the extreme of charity is but simple justice. But the warning of his life ought to be read as well as its encouragement. Nature's law is inexorable, and his early and chronic transgression of the great law of Rest wrought out effects which cannot be ignored in any just estimate of him.* One effect of over-stimulation

* Professor E. L. Youmans makes an impressive statement on this point: "The one great physiological law upon which bodily and mental health are alike dependent, is the alternation of action and repose which results from the limitation of power. The eternal equation of vital vigor is, *rest equals exercise*. . . . But there lurks in this statement a deeper and more dangerous meaning than at first appears. The equilibrium once lost is

upon a temperament like his is to heighten sensibility, while it impairs power. It makes vivid the perception of the thing to be done, keen the longing to do it, but weak the faculty to execute. This condition of the brain is one key to the pathetic exclamations at his own incapacity which now and then occur in his letters. Often at the very time he uttered them he was doing some stroke of work which judged by ordinary standards was altogether admirable. But he felt, and felt truly, that he might do still finer work, had he but a fuller reservoir of physical vitality to draw from; and the same nervous condition which limited his work exasperated the consciousness of his limitations.

In another way his unresting activity served to imprison him. It forbade the free reception of those influences from the outer world which emancipate the soul from personal cares, by giving to it the sense of a larger and diviner being. The highest office of natural beauty is to vividly impress this sense of some spiritual power environing man. Rightly seen, the face of Nature imparts as direct a sense of some spiritual reality of which it is the outward symbol, as the sense which a man's face conveys of a soul behind it. In our higher moods and clearer perceptions, all form is seen as a manifestation of spirit, and the highest form, beauty, is a revelation of the

most difficult to restore,— there is a fatal persistence in the morbid state. It is a general law of the animal economy, that when the vital powers are, from any cause, depressed below a certain point, they are not easily, and sometimes are never, repaired. . . . As might be expected, the brain illustrates this principle more effectively than any other portion of the system: if worked beyond its limits there is a rapid exhaustion of power which renders repose impossible. The exhaustion of overwork is accompanied by excitement which tends to perpetuate the work and accelerate the exhaustion. The will is thus swamped in the uncontrollable mobility of the automatic system, the attention becomes insanely exalted, the brain will not be ordered to rest, and words of warning are wasted."—*Culture Demanded by Modern Life*, p. 401.

highest spiritual quality,—goodness and love. This man had in him the capacity to read this deeper meaning of Nature. His sense of it finds words before such a scene as the Yo-Semite: "It was the confronting of God face to face, as in great danger, in solemn sudden death. All that was mortal shrank back, all that was immortal swept to the front and bent down in awe."

In the most familiar and homely guise of Nature, there is a sacramental significance to the mind that is attuned to receive it. There is another revelation through humanity. In the face of a child, in any action that discloses a fine trait, in any moment of vital contact with a true man or woman, there may be given to the soul the sense of the God that dwells in man. But the conditions of that inner sight are that the soul shall be educated by obedience to its highest laws; that sympathy shall have made it sensitive, and self-control made it strong; and that then it shall be held calm as a mirror to catch the heavenly vision.

The heavenly vision would have been possible to this man, the "peace which passeth understanding" might have been his, could he have made room and leisure in his crowded life to receive it. He had the latent capacity for it; under the discipline of life he had developed a susceptibility to those fine undertones;—but their music was drowned, and the sensitive avenues were choked up, by the incessant hurry of his own activities. His perpetual doing kept his nature ruffled like a lake under constant winds. "I never saw in his face," said a friend, "the expression of repose — the look was always of fire or of tire."

In action he was great, in passivity he was wholly deficient, and to a symmetrical life a right passivity is as essential as right action. The want of it makes the soul's own activities a wall which shuts it in. The sense of a

greater than self — of a God enfolding men — is possible only when the mind lies passive and open. Without that sense, life has no full rest or peace.

His over-activity was partly a virtue carried to excess. His sense of responsibility was too strong. He felt bound to do many things which he might better have left to other people, or let them go undone. Perhaps this trait was due to the fact that he assumed the full burden of manly responsibility when he was but eighteen years old,— the pressure began too early, and wrought too deeply the instinct of care-taking. "I had very little boyhood," he said at the end of his life. His resolute purpose to succeed, and the necessity of constant arduous labor, engendered a passion of thoroughness. He would, as Dr. Holland says, lengthen a long day's work by an hour after midnight, for the sake of an unimportant piece of proof-reading. His zeal for doing was not confined to his newspaper,— he must needs oversee the details of the household, take care for all his friends' interests, be watchful for every want of the neighborhood, the town, and the nation. As his affections widened and deepened, he grew in generous and prodigal desire to serve those whom he loved. He was many-sided in his tastes and capacities; he was responsive to every good cause; he lived at a time when social interests were multiplying, intensifying, and making perpetual appeal to every willing worker,— and his answer to the call was only too willing and too unbalanced by self-protection. With this disposition there blended the physical effect of excessive exertion, which reacted upon the body in enfeeblement and upon the mind in a morbid propensity to constant action. In some degree the result was a necessary price of the great achievement he wrought. The gallant worker willingly pays for the privilege of doing his work a price whose costliest part is some sacrifice of his inner self. As he

said of himself: "A man isn't good for much unless he is willing to die for something or somebody — at least to die a *little!*" What did die in him was more than "a little,"— it was the essential capacity of repose. When something of leisure came to him, it was too late to develop the power of inward rest. On occasion he could idle charmingly among his friends; but to lie passive and free, to drink in the soothing influences of Nature and solitude till the filled and peaceful soul feels itself cradled on the Mother-heart — this he could not do. That capacity was destroyed in him as much as the capacity for untroubled sleep.

The mischief had been wrought before it was realized. The possibility of prevention was in early years when the danger was not foreseen. It was the generation to which he belonged which first experienced on a broad scale the mischiefs of nervous overwork. The fathers had not felt it in their moderate life, and had not guarded their sons against it. If Samuel Bowles, when a boy, had spent outdoors, in skating and playing ball and tramping over the fields, half the hours he passed in poring over newspapers; and if, from the time he went into the *Republican* office, he had taken one or two hours a day of open-air exercise,— his work might have been larger, and his happiness far greater. But, like so many other men, he spent all his reserve capital; and when he began to feel poverty, it was too late to retrieve the loss.

In a measure, too, his want of peace was due to his failure to learn one great lesson. He never thoroughly learned to give up his will. His life was to its very end a struggle to dominate his circumstances. In many aspects it was a heroic struggle. But life is not a complete success unless a man learns not only to struggle but to yield,— to yield not as to overpowering destiny, but to something higher and better than his own desire.

Man is not the master of the universe. So long as he tries to dominate it by his will, he breaks himself against the forces that surround and hold him. In a larger sense than Bacon gave to the words, "Nature is governed by obeying her." Man's full victory comes when he recognizes that his own supremacy over events is neither possible nor desirable; when his heart is supremely set, not on any personal end, but only on the highest right, the widest good; and when in the sense of his own impotence he rests gladly upon the higher power. The key-word of life is "Thy will be done."

There were in this man certain central desires and purposes which he never willingly yielded. When anything crossed those desires and purposes he overrode it if he could, and if it overrode him the defeat was bitter. At some points he could submit neither to men nor to destiny. He *must* succeed, he *must* be strong, he *must* dominate in his own field. To command success, to win full expression and achievement for all the powers within him, to conquer disease, to hold Death himself at bay, to keep at all hazards and for all time his masterful grip on the world,— this was his ceaseless effort. Many troubles he bore with patience and philosophy, but at certain points he never could yield. In the administration of his newspaper he could brook no thwarting or hindrance from any man. He refused to obey the most imperative warnings of nature that he must absolutely desist from work. When an irresistible hand was laid upon his vital powers, when a voice said, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther," when he felt that he never should attain his ideals of work and expression, when at last the inexorable end approached, he could not accept or be reconciled. He was too proud and strong for weak complaint, but it all touched him with a bitterness of despair.

The man who, even though like this man he be brave, sincere, serviceable, and loving, yet is bent on making men and events bow to his own will, has missed a part of the secret of living. Though he should master all his fellows, he does it at too great a cost. And the laws of the universe he cannot master. With advancing years, with waning strength, with that sense of sharp personal limitations which no child of Adam escapes,—shadows must invade his brightest hours, and life must lack that deep-hearted cheer which belongs to it by right. Destiny changes from tyrant to friend only when man learns to yield the most cherished personal desire, for duty's sake, or for the sake of other men, or in trustful acceptance of the inevitable. Then only comes the sense that the sovereign Power is beneficent and tender,—then only the soul is borne upon the Peaceful Sea, and the tempest of Fate becomes the breath of God.

CHAPTER XXXV.

Works and Ways.

THE year 1868 saw some notable changes in the staff of the paper. Mr. Hood was about taking final leave, on account of ill health. Mr. Frank B. Sanborn, who had been for some years an occasional contributor, now came to Springfield for a while as a regular editorial writer. He was a man of wide and scholarly culture, with especial aptness in literary quotation, an expert in social science and public charities, and a prolific writer on political and social topics. The staff was also strengthened by the presence for a year or two of General Francis A. Walker, a forcible and brilliant writer, especially versed in political economy. Mr. Pomeroy and Mr. Phelps remained as managing and local editors. Among his junior assistants, Mr. Bowles began this year the training of two young men who became members of the group of workers in whose hands he left the paper at his death,— Mr. Charles G. Whiting and Mr. Wilmot L. Warren. Mr. Whiting thus photographed his chief, in an article written some years after his death :

"He was a man of notable presence, tall, spare, nervous, with keen cavalier face, full brown beard and dark brown hair that was neither of Indian stiffness nor of effeminate curl, but between the two ; a rich brown-red complexion, a strong nose, and brilliant and divining eyes before which no falsehood could

stand. . . . He was often severe, and sometimes the young apprentice would feel that he was cruel; but he was as generous in praise as stern in censure, and a word of approval from 'the chief,' coupled with one of his wonderful smiles, was worth a hundred flatteries besides. The personal aura which surrounded him in social intercourse was nowhere more potent than with his young men in the office, where he criticised and inspired them."

When Mr. Bowles came into the office for his day's work, it was in a rapid, brusque fashion, sometimes without a good-morning to any one. He never used many words. He would speak to one man a quick sentence as he passed; call another to his room and give him in two minutes the points for an editorial; another would find on his desk a very brief note of direction or admonition. A man would often work for weeks or even months without any word of notice, and then would come a terse comment, hitting the weak point or heartening him with praise. One youngster who had not fully mastered the department assigned him, as he was whistling at his desk heard the words thrown over his shoulder as the chief went by, "You needn't think you're doing that work very well." He didn't whistle again for a week! Yet just afterward Mr. Bowles wrote to some inquirer a generous commendation of him. A man whose hours of work had been somewhat irregular found on his desk the message: "Good-night at ten, sharp. Good-morning at nine, sharp." A writer who made an incidental criticism upon Dr. Holland's ideas about women — Dr. H. having left the paper some years before — was called up the next morning: "I see you made a thrust at Dr. Holland. Never do that again. Nobody is allowed to abuse Dr. Holland in this paper — except myself,"— the last words said with a twinkle that took off the edge of the severity. He was never petty or nagging in his criticisms. He did not expect his writers

to run their thoughts in the mold of his own. His spirit and style were infectious to those who worked under him; he inspired rather than drilled them. If an article was on the whole well written, he would neither reject nor remold it because of minor divergences from his own thought or method. His criticism would be, "Next time do so and so." But if an article or a paragraph was handed to him that was slovenly or radically faulty, he would perhaps tear it up and dictate on the spot what he wanted said.

"When I was there," said General Walker, "he was suffering from sciatica and dyspepsia. A cloud would come over him so sudden and heavy that I could liken it to nothing but the moods of Saul. Sometimes he would come into the office at noon, and I would see by his haggard look he had had a bad night. He would say nothing to me nor I to him. He would look around, give a grunt, tip things about a little, and go out. Next morning he would come in cheerful, put his arm around me, and call me by my first name." One of his staff, talking with him once at his home,—where the tense manner of the office was always exchanged for a winning geniality,—asked him frankly, "Why do you sometimes go round among us silent and black as a thunder-cloud?" "I tell you," he answered, "there are times when the greatest kindness I can do my friends is to keep silent toward them." All of his staff understood and allowed for the physical burdens he carried. They encountered the sharpest side of him, yet every one of them felt a warm personal loyalty to him, and was glad to work under him. Said another of their number: "He couldn't help his sharpness,—the physical substance that is the basis of good-nature was partly destroyed in him." Another thus describes a first impression:

"When I went to look for a place on the *Republican*, Mr. Bowles sent for me to come to his house. He was in bed, recovering from a terrible attack of sciatica. His appearance greatly impressed me. The brilliancy of his eyes was such as I had never seen. They wore that look of softness and desire to please which he could exercise beyond any one in the world. His hands were full of expression,— very nervous. Every trait in him was characteristic and full of individuality. I remember noticing his way of giving an odd wrinkle to the upper part of his face, so that his eye-glasses flew off with a click. He outlined the work I should have to do, and gave me some general principles about it, and then said, 'You may think a newspaper office a strange place to cultivate regular habits in, but I strongly advise you to be as regular in your habits as possible, — you will find it the best way.' He said this not like a moralist, but like a man of the world. After he had talked with me for a while, though in the place I was leaving I was getting three hundred dollars a year and my board, he made me feel that thirty dollars a month was an El Dorado."

One of the staff, who was detailed as Mr. Bowles's private secretary, gives these reminiscences:

"The effect of his personality on his workers was to keep them under a strain. It was somewhat oppressive, but it got out of a man the best work there was in him. If a man did well, nothing was said. If he did ill, he was sure to hear of it. If he did remarkably well, he was apt to be told of that. Mr. Bowles never spoke sharply to me. But a shrug of the shoulders or a glance was enough! It was not his way to lecture or scold. The reproof came generally in a short, pointed sentence. He would shoot out such a remark as he passed a man at his desk. His praise came in the same way, and sometimes it was generous and unexpected. He always kept the office shaken up, never letting the men get into ruts. Once he had invited half a dozen gentlemen from out of town to a dinner at his house. On the day appointed he came down to the office nicely dressed, with a button-hole bouquet, and presently began

to wonder that he received no replies. He telegraphed to the guests, and learned that none of them had received an invitation. I had written the invitations, and my mind misgave me. When I went home that night I found that in changing my coat I had left them all in the pocket unmailed! I didn't sleep well that night. Next day I went to him and told the story, and he took it with perfect amiability, and not a word or look of reproof."

Almost all his staff occupied a double relation to him,— the official and the personal. While at work he inspired the promptest obedience, and a respect in which fear mingled with admiration. Every man felt stimulated to do his utmost, and every man caught something of the chief's spirit and method. But outside of work they found in him a sympathetic and helpful friend. One of his former pupils wrote in the *Evening Post* at the time of his death:

"If there was any ability in a young man the *Republican* office would develop it; if there was none it would discover that fact also in very short order. Mr. Bowles had a short, incisive way about him, which was very inspiring to an ambitious young man, though very distressing to a shirker. While the novice was under training, he saw very little of his chief; but after a few weeks, when it was reasonable to suppose that the methods of the office had been learned, Mr. Bowles was frequently heard from. The first mistake or error in judgment would be carefully pointed out and corrected, but woe to the unfortunate wight who should twice stumble over the same obstacle. The overhauling he would get would make his ears tingle for a week, and it was a rare circumstance that the mistake again occurred. He could make a man feel smaller and more insignificant than anybody else I ever met, but even when he was most excited there was an undercurrent of pleasantry in his vigorous remarks. . . . Nobody denies to him the credit of making good newspaper men, and I have yet to learn of one who went out from the *Republican* with his recommendation

who has made a failure in the profession. There was nothing in his power which he would leave unemployed to aid a young man who had tried to do his duty faithfully, and as for myself I shall not soon forget the friendly counsel and assistance which he has rendered me in more than one doubtful condition of my affairs. No man had a warmer heart, a more helpful disposition, and a more generous sympathy for a struggling young man."

One of his female friends, who visited in his family, writes:

"Of his office-work I once caught an interesting glimpse. 'Come,' he said, 'this is too glorious a night for sleep,— I dare you to walk to the office with me, all in the moonlight. If it *is* too late, Mary will not care.' 'Yes, Mary cares very much; he is in misery with dyspepsia, and I ask you to go,' insisted Mary. We went. 'I will not remain long in the office, and will bring you back before Mary has knit in the middle of her needle, metaphorically speaking. Come, learn something of an editor's life; only if you hear secrets, don't betray them, for I may forget you are present.'

"As we entered the office, hastily pointing me to a chair, he fell into conversation with a person who was writing at the table, and asked rapid questions: 'Did you do this? and this? have you sent that letter? Did Chapin come in? Did he care? Right down mad?—Well, I can explain it all. Send Mifflin to me'—(these names and topics are of course fictitious)— Mifflin came. 'Have you looked up the matter of the Railroads?' 'Yes.' 'What I believed was right?' 'Yes, and more besides.' 'Then put it all into an article three-quarters of a column long — not a word longer — clear, decided, as if you felt the ground under your feet. That's all. Will you send Chapman? Good evening, Mr. Chapman — Now I want to settle the business about the compromise, once for all — no compromise in the way we do it. You need not be unjust, but hit 'em hard. Your last was longer than I told you to have it,— don't be wordy, keep within the exact limit of a quarter column. Is Endicott within?—Ah, Endicott, glad to see you:

have you worked up the school business? Don't be afraid because some of the men are ministers; we'll prove that we are "God Almighty's gentlemen" ourselves. These wrongs ought to be righted, and if we must, we will shame them out of their indifference, clergy and all. A column and a half you may take,— I need not tell *you* not to be lengthy,— shorter if you choose, but say it strong.'

"Thus quickly and decisively he passed in review the members of his staff. As we once more emerged into the cool moonlight he remarked, 'That's done. The women-writers,— I don't like "lady-writers," do you? the phrase is in the same category with "gents,"— luckily the women-writers are all at home, as we soon shall be. Women are fascinating creatures; yet it is treading upon eggs all the time to deal with them. A man who is in earnest about his work does not stop to think that he is not a machine; — but women, bless their hearts! want to be considered, deferred to; they receive the unvarnished truth as if it were a red-hot bullet.'

"'Would you, then, prefer a woman without sensitiveness and dignity?'

"'Never, as my friend. Yet sometimes I think that for working purposes, I would like to try one. For instance, when I am hurried, fretted, dyspeptic, cross at some unjust attack, I want to rave and tear a little — a strong man has to. Yes, I love gentleness, but the gentle creatures must keep out of my way when these turns come on. I am free to own that sometimes I have made them shed many tears,— hated myself for it,— and that was not the least of the wrong they did me. A man does not enjoy hating himself. Here we are, home!'"

Of the life in that home, and especially of his relations with his own family, something more will be shown in a later chapter. His daily routine in later years varied at different periods, but for a considerable period it was this: he rang his bell about eight or nine, as the signal for bringing him a glass of water and the morning's *Republican*. Then he took, generally in his room, a light breakfast — a dropped egg, oatmeal, or the

like. He then read the paper through carefully, and marked articles and items which were to go into the Weekly. Next some one appeared from the office, with letters and latest advices. He spent the forenoon in dictating editorials and correspondence. At one o'clock he took lunch with the family. The afternoon was passed at the office. His dinner hour was six, and he would come home often late and generally very tired; frequently having been button-holed just before coming away by people who had run in to talk with him after their day's work was done. After dinner he sometimes lay down for a little while, and then joined the family for the evening. The last thing was to look over the editorial proofs, sent up about eleven o'clock. Later editorials he trusted to his subordinates.

When his first children were babies, he did not pay much attention to them. They seemed to be born to him when their intellectual and moral natures developed. But when the later ones came, he loved to frolic with them from their earliest babyhood. He was very devoted to his children. He studied their individualities, entered into their interests, and educated them to take responsibility. He disciplined them little and never scolded them. Once in a while a very youthful offender might be brought to him in the library by an older sister whose authority had failed, but that judgment-seat was apt to prove a very pleasant visiting-place.

His chief recreation was the society of men and women. Some friends he specially prized for their unstimulating and rest-giving quality. The intellectual and nervous man has no more valuable acquaintances than those who act as comfortable cushions. One kind of hospitality in which he specially shone was the little dinners he used to give. The guests on these occasions were men; they were chosen with an eye to mutual fitness, and included

always some good listeners. No matter how distinguished some of the circle might be, Mr. Bowles dropped in among them in the most informal way, fell into some careless attitude, implying that he was under no restraint in any human presence, and all restraint melted at once from his guests. Every one was at his ease and at his best; there was no labored rivalry; the talk flowed delightfully on; the host contributing his full share of the good things, and deftly calling into play the special gift of each.

During the latter part of his life he was the leading spirit in "The Club." This was a little society founded by Judge R. A. Chapman, who continued to be its chief promoter while he lived in Springfield. Dr. Holland and Rev. R. H. Seelye were also among its earlier lights. Mr. Bowles was at that time too much absorbed in his work to take an active part. Afterward he became the life of the weekly gatherings. Among the other members were John L. King, Daniel L. Harris, Judge Soule, Colonel Benton, Dr. David P. Smith, Rev. Dr. S. G. Buckingham, Rev. Dr. William Rice, Rev. John Harding of Longmeadow, A. D. Briggs, N. A. Leonard, and other leading citizens. The evening began with a supper; then there was a free discussion of some appointed subject; and following this, the answer of each to the general question: "What fact, thought, experience, have you lately met with which we should like to hear about?"— this being generally the most interesting part of the talk.

Mr. Bowles's reading was desultory. Some of the best new books always lay on his table,—fewer of novels, and also of scientific works, than of essays, histories, travels, and poems. Emerson was a favorite with him. He had a season of special admiration for Carlyle, from which he somewhat cooled; what specially attracted him was the vigor of Carlyle's style. Once in playing

the game of "Mental Photographs,"— answering a series of questions as to one's tastes and perferences,— he replied with some thought to the question, "What is your favorite book?" "One is likely," he said, "to name the *last* favorite,— but I should select 'Marcus Aurelius' and Browning's 'Men and Women.'" The choice was characteristic,— the mingled stoicism and sweetness of the philosopher, and the strong dramatic humanity of the poet.

For the good things of the palate he had a dainty and delicate taste, and knew how to give them their right place as ingredients of good-fellowship. He was always moderate in his eating, and had to practice during the last half of his life a good deal of abstemiousness. In his drinking he kept always far within the limit of excess. He smoked only on rare occasions. Cards were among his occasional diversions. He played eucher well. Whist, as a scientific game, was often too laborious for his mood, and at such times he played, if at all, with happy indifference to the venerable authority of Hoyle and the new lights of Pole. But when he matched himself, as he did now and then, with a group of good players such as Chester W. Chapin, he rose to the occasion, and his companions found a foeman worthy of their steel. He enjoyed the theater, and used to find in it part of the recreation of his visits to New York. He spoke with regret of the poverty of a provincial town like Springfield in theatricals; wherein he might have cited the authority of Franklin, who said, evidently comparing Philadelphia and London a century ago, that the chief inferiority of a provincial compared with a metropolitan city was in its want of theatrical entertainments.

For pleasure and for health, Mr. Bowles had frequent recourse to driving and riding. He kept always one horse or two. Black "Pone" was for many years an

important member of the domestic establishment. A favorite lounging-place was the stable-office of his friend William S. Collins. Here he often loitered for half an hour on his way up or down town. No one better appreciated the aspects of human nature which crop out among a group of men "talking horse,"—the bragging, the mystifications, the clever steering just outside of a lie, the matching of wits. He had no eye for the "points" of a horse; he knew when an animal served his turn, and that was all he cared for. He did not establish any personal understanding with his steed, but handled it according to his own mood. "He was fonder of reckless driving," said William Collins, "than any man I ever knew." Not seldom he would come to the stable of an afternoon, jaded and silent, take a good horse with William for driver, and speed over the dozen miles of pleasant country road to Mount Vision, a spot on the western slope of the Wilbraham hills, commanding a very wide and noble prospect. Scarcely a word would be said, till, stopping on the brow of the hill, and having looked for a few minutes over the calm uplifting scene, he would say to his appreciative companion, "William, that's good!"—then quietly jog home. He was repeatedly run away with, by steeds less docile than the virtuous Pone. "Once," said a lady, "he was driving me with a span of horses that had run away a day or two before. At one of the grade crossings that Springfield is full of, a train at full speed surprised us when we were almost on the track. He shot over his shoulder at me a glance that gave courage, and said, 'Sorry—can't help it—let 'em go,'—and we dashed across the track, the engine barely missing us. He only said, 'Didn't go in for this, did you?' Then, seeing my nerves were shaken, he stopped and got me a glass of wine, without any fuss or worry."

One of his favorite resorts was the house of his friend Austin Dickinson at Amherst. It was a place where he was perfectly at home; he was on terms of brotherly intimacy with Mr. and Mrs. Dickinson, and the children knew him as "Uncle Sam." Here he would occasionally come to spend a Sunday, often driving up through the beautiful mountain gap; sometimes arriving unannounced, sometimes telegraphing his advent, with a petition for some favorite dish. He was glad to be spared from callers, and would give himself up to lazy enjoyment; now talking on every subject except his newspaper, now picking up the last new book, now lying silent on the lounge. On some of these visits, Dr. David P. Smith was his companion, and under their mutual incitement the talk was very bright. Sometimes on his return home he would write back, "You gave me too rich food,—the talk was too stimulating." But at other times he would sink into easy idleness. In such a mood once as he lay on the piazza with the apple-blossoms blowing over him,—"This," he said, "I guess, is as near heaven as we shall ever get in this life!"

He was a trustee of Amherst College from 1866 until his death. The suggestion that the legislature should elect him to the place seemed at first a strange one. Sam Bowles — a free lance, a heretic — to be made a trustee of the stanch orthodox institution, founded half a century before as a bulwark against the heresies of Harvard! But President Stearns took kindly to the idea. The *Republican* had always been very friendly to both Amherst and Williams Colleges, and had given full and sympathetic reports of their anniversaries; and Mr. Bowles's energy and shrewdness recommended him for a business manager. His election was actively promoted by Edward and Austin Dickinson and Mr. Gillett, with the coöperation of Dr. R. S. Storrs. It was a compliment which

keenly gratified Mr. Bowles, and it proved an excellent choice for the college. Said Dr. Storrs:

"He was not only one of the most faithful and punctual of the Board in his duties, but one of the most intelligent and wide-seeing. His judgment of men and measures was sagacious. He was free to express his own pet ideas, in favor of co-education, elective and non-classical courses, etc., but he always took the ground: 'This institution was founded for a definite purpose — classical education, with an especial view to the Christian ministry, and to this the original endowments are sacred. But can we not add to our resources, and provide further means for other kinds of education besides this?'"

Said another of his colleagues:

"He annoyed some of the trustees by occasionally making public what they were not ready to disclose, but all of them liked him and relied on him. He was perhaps the most useful member of the Board, through his acquaintance with men and knowledge of practical affairs."

Mr. Bowles expressed to a friend his attitude toward the college thus:

"When I go to Amherst I'm just as orthodox as any member of the Board! If I were making a college, I should not make it sectarian, or give much place to dogmatic teaching. But Amherst College is a good institution,—there's no measuring the service it has done. Its strength is in its alumni, and they prize its religious character. That it is not built on just my plan is no reason why I should not help and serve it. I always vote and speak for keeping up the traditions of the college as to religion. Its religion is a part of its strength."

From the frequent illness that beset him in the early part of 1868,— when "it seemed," he said, "as if the bottom was falling out,"— Mr. Bowles sought relief in a journey to Colorado, during August and September, again with Speaker Colfax and Governor Bross as fellow-

travelers, and now with his eldest daughter and several other ladies in the company. Most of the time was passed in mountain excursions, with open-air life in saddle and camp. It was an admirable resource for toning up a jaded constitution. He wrote a series of letters to the *Republican*, which were collected in a book entitled "The Switzerland of America." This and "Across the Continent" were the only books he compiled from his writings, except two or three papers collected from the *Atlantic Monthly* under the title "The Pacific Railroad Open." "The Switzerland of America" had a sale of 8000 copies. Its contents and those of "Across the Continent" were afterward condensed into one volume, entitled "Our New West," which was sold by subscription to the number of 23,000 copies.

The charm of "The Switzerland of America" lies greatly in its open-air quality. Constant felicitous touches impart to the reader a sympathetic sense of the exhilarating gallop, the healthy fatigue, the joviality beside the camp-fire. Of the country this is the bird's-eye view in the Preface:

"The distinctive physical feature of Colorado is her wide elevated parks, lying among the double and treble folds of the continental range of mountains — great plains, like counties in Illinois and Iowa, or states in New England, six thousand to nine thousand feet above the sea-level, surrounded by mountains that rise from three to five thousand feet higher; plains, green with grass, dark with forests, bright with flowers; mountains, dreary with rocks, white with snow. The distinctive charm is the atmosphere, so clear and pure and dry all the while as to be a perpetual feeling rather than vision of beauty; invigorating every sense, softly soothing every pain, lending a glory to landscape and life alike, clothing every feature of nature with beauty, and giving the eye of every spectator the power to see it — this is the indescribable thing that lifts Colorado out of other lackings, and more than compensates, in the

comparison, for what is peculiar to Switzerland. Here, where the great backbone of the continent rears and rests itself; here, where Nature sets the patterns of plain and mountain, of valley and field, for all America; here, where spring the waters that wash two-thirds of the western continent, and feed both its oceans; here, where mountains are fat with gold and silver, and prairies glory in the glad certainty of future harvests of corn and wheat,—here indeed is the center and the central life of America, fountain of its wealth and health and beauty. Switzerland is pleasure and health; Colorado is these, and use besides—the use of beauty and the use of profitable work united."

Here is a piece of flower-painting:

"I wish I could repeat the roll of their array of beauties, for the benefit of my flower-learned readers; I know most of them very well by sight, as the boy said of his unlearned alphabet, but cannot call them by name. Blue and yellow are the dominating colors; of the former several varieties of little bell and trumpet shaped blossoms, pendent along stalwart stalks; again, a similar shaped flower, but more delicate, a little tube in pink and white, seems original here; and of the golden hues there are babies and grand-babies of the sunflower family in every shade and shape. One of these, about the size of a small tea-saucer, holds a center stem or spike of richest maroon red, with deepest yellow leaves flaring away from it,—each color the very concentration and ripeness of itself, as if dyed at the very fountain-head. The harebell is at home everywhere; drooping modestly and alone on the exposed mountain-side at eleven thousand or twelve thousand feet, as well as in the protected parks among all its rivals; but the fringed gentian is more fastidious, and grows only where nature is richer, but then in such masses, with such deep blueness and such undeviating uprightness of stem, as to prove its birthright here. The painter's brush, as familiarly called here, is a new flower to me; something like the soldier's pompon in form, it stands stiff and distinct on a single stalk, about six inches tall, three inches in length, and one inch in thickness or diameter of

flower, in every shade of red from deepest crimson to pale pink, and again in straw colors from almost white to deep lemon. We picked on a single morning's ride seven of different shades of red. A bunch of the brightest of this flower, with a sprinkling of those of milder hues and a few grasses, such as could be gathered in five minutes in many a patch of Alpine meadow we pass through, was enough to set a flower-lover crazy with delight. It was a beacon, a flame of color, and would make a room aglow like a brilliant picture or wood fire on the hearth. But perhaps the most bewitching of flowers we discovered was a columbine, generous but delicate, of pale but firm purple and pure white — it was very exquisite in form and shading. Higher up, where only mosses could grow for rock and snow, these were in great variety and richness, with white, with blue, and with pink blossoms."

Southern Colorado was about this time suffering much from Indian raids, and for one day and night alarms of near danger fell thick upon the party.

"It was a night to remember with a shiver,— lying down in that far-off wilderness with the reasonable belief that before morning there was an even chance of an attack of hostile Indians upon our camp, more than half of whose number were women and children,— after an evening spent in discussing the tender ways Indians had with their captives, illustrated from the personal knowledge of many present; aroused after the first hour's feverish rest by a new messenger from another quarter, galloping into camp, and shouting, as if we were likely to forget, that 'the Indians were loose, and hell was to pay'; followed by the coming of a furious storm of rain and hail and thunder and lightning, sucking under our tents, beating through them, to wet pillows and blankets,— at any other time a dire grievance, now hardly an added trial; every ear stretched for unaccustomed sound, every heart beating anxiously, but every lip silent; all eagerly awaiting the slow-coming morning to bring renewal of life and the opportunity to go further on and to safer retreats. To confess the unprosaic

individual fact,— while I report the general truth,— this deponent had the soundest, sweetest night's sleep he had had in the mountains."

The highest power and charm of the book is in its descriptions of high mountain scenery. Of these the most striking, though some others are almost equally fine, pictures the view from Grey's Peak:

"It was the great sight in all our Colorado travel. In impressiveness, in overcomingness, it takes rank with the three or four great natural wonders of the world,— with Niagara Falls from the Tower, with the Yo-Semite Valley from Inspiration Point. No Swiss mountain view carries such majestic sweeps of distance, such sublime combination of height and depth and breadth; such uplifting into the presence of God; such dwarfing of the mortal sense, such welcome to the immortal thought. It was not beauty, it was sublimity; it was not power, nor order, nor color, it was majesty; it was not a part, it was the whole; it was not man, but God, that was about, before, in us. Mountains and mountains everywhere,— even the great parks, even the unending plains, seemed but patches among the white ranges of hills stretching above and beyond one another. We looked into Middle Park below us on the north, over a single line of mountains into South Park below us on the south,— but beyond both were the unending peaks, the everlasting hills. To the west, the broadest, noblest ranges of mountains — there seemed no breaks among them, except such as served to mark the end of one and the beginning of another, and no possible limit to their extension. The snow whitened all, covered many, and brought out their lines in conspicuous majesty. Over one of the largest and finest the snow fields lay in the form of an immense cross, and by this it is known in all the mountain views of the territory. It is as if God had set his sign, his seal, his promise there,— a beacon upon the very center and height of the continent, to all its people and all its generations. Beyond this uplifted what seemed to be the only mountain in all the range of view higher than the peak upon which we stood. It is named Sopris

Peak upon some of the maps, but has never been explored and is more completely covered with snow than any other.

"Turning to the east, we find relief in the softer and yet majestic and unending vision of the plains,— on, on, they stretch in everlasting green and gray, until lost in the dim haze that is just beginning to rise along the horizon. Directly below us, great rough seams in the mountain-sides, as if fire and water had been at work for ages to waste and overturn; dreary areas of red and brown and gray rocks; masses of timber; bits of green in the far-down valley; flashes of darkness where little lakes nestled amid the rocks, fed by snow and feeding the streams — Nature everywhere in her original forms, and her abounding waste of wealth, as if here was the great supply store and workshop of Creation, the fountain of Earth."

CHAPTER XXXVI.

The War Against Corruption.

THE re-admission of almost all the Southern states to the Union in 1868 marked the end of one great epoch in American history. The new epoch thrust its problems and its labors upon a generation equipped and trained under the exigencies of the old. The men who had both the insight and the courage of leadership recognized the new necessities, and began to break the fresh paths. The mass of the community were slow to change front, and were long suspicious or hostile toward the new ways. This was the situation which gave to the last decade of Mr. Bowles's work its special significance.

For a quarter of a century the moral sentiment of the nation had been concentrating against a single great evil, slavery, and its offspring, secession. Both were now at an end. But the habit of thought and feeling generated in the conflict remained after the proper objects of its attack had been swept away. The leaders and the party organization that had been the instruments of victory had drawn to themselves a passionate attachment which continued to support them with little scrutiny as to their real merit or fitness for the new order of things. Under cover of the popular absorption in the war and its sequences, a crop of evils and mischiefs had thriven unnoticed; and it was difficult to bring to bear on them the

conscience of the community, habituated to spend itself against another foe. Men went on fearing the dead lions of secession and slavery more than the living dogs of political corruption.

The moral atmosphere had been highly charged with enthusiasm. The hostility to slavery had been a sentiment simple, direct, and intense. The war had raised to the highest pitch the passions of the community from the noblest to the basest, from the mother's self-sacrifice down to the rage of the fighting animal. It was inevitable that the cooling of this white heat should be a slow process. The results of the war had affected very differently the temper of the North and of the South. The South — invaded, impoverished, overpowered, held in subjection — had become sobered; it was laying new foundations; it was groping its way amid the débris of the wreck and the evil legacies of slavery. The North, ennobled by a strife for a great cause, teeming with activities and prosperities, was yet somewhat feverish. Its politics were partisan; its currency and trade were inflated. America was beginning a new stage of development. Invention had for half a century been forging tools of magic; railroads were opening the vast domain of the North-west; slavery and civil war had passed away together; the nation, full of power and of ardor, moved forward like a young giant. While Europe was in throes of re-adjustment; while Prussia and Austria, Germany and France, were dashing against each other; while menace of social revolution was agitating the older continent, the people of the United States were free to turn all their energies toward the pursuits of peaceful life.

The most striking phase of this new development was at first material progress. The political danger lay no longer in a concrete institution, but in more insidious corruption. Political adventurers traded on the enthu-

siasm of the people. Lobbyists carried on their schemes unseen amid the dust raised by hot debates on questions which really belonged to history and not to politics. The nation had an enormous funded debt and a depreciated currency: zeal without discretion hastened to pay off the funded debt, while leaving the currency unredeemable,—like a man who should anticipate payment of his long-time notes, while leaving his demand notes dishonored;—and the people went on cheerfully paying enormous taxes for lessening the future debt, while shrinking from the temporary inconvenience attendant on a restoration of the currency. Great projects of money-making throve and multiplied; corporations enriched by the government used their wealth to corrupt legislation; the tendency to speculation was stimulated by a currency of fluctuating value; business expansion and private extravagance went on till checked by the disaster of 1873. Bestowal of public office as a reward for partisan service, an evil of long standing, had been confirmed when Lincoln virtually transferred the patronage from his overworked Administration to the Republican congressmen. Its mischief was widened by the multiplication of executive officers; its wrong was only slowly appreciated by the people at large. The Democratic party at the North had been debauched and demoralized by its attitude during the war, and the Republican party had become so sacred in the eyes of most of its adherents that under its shelter abuses found easy tolerance.

The progressive political work of the years from 1868 on was largely of a very disagreeable kind. It consisted very much in the rooting out of abuses both old and new. A great deal of it resembled more the work of a policeman than of a prophet. It often involved attack on usages and persons that had received the toleration,

the respect, or the affection of well-disposed people. It lacked the inspiration and the glow which supported men in facing pro-slavery mobs or shouldering their muskets to fight. Its sustaining motive was a hard prosaic sense of duty. The leaders in it put themselves under fire from the whole army of knaves, leagued by instinctive sympathy against the assailant of any one of them, and had often to undergo a worse fire in the rear from an honest and enthusiastic multitude who saw rude hands laid on their idols.

This was the work to which the time and his genius summoned Mr. Bowles for the last ten years of his life. He had all the needed qualities. His ripe intelligence was swift to seize the changed aspect of the times. His personal experience had trained him to regard the frugalities, the economies, the business moralities, which it was needful now to apply to public affairs. No eye was keener than his to see through the disguises of corruption and demagogy. He had the critical aggressive temper which the emergencies of the time required. The bonds of subservience to public opinion, of private friendship over public right, of commercial interest over conviction, — all these it had been the habit of his life to break through. "Independent journalism" was the conviction and the passion of that life, and now the supreme opportunity and need of independent journalism were come.

The summons of the time was imperative, and he obeyed it. The work of his later years was largely a work of criticism and controversy. It was in those years that the *Republican* acquired its reputation as a journalistic scourge. It was in those years that it fought Butler, the abuses of the Grant Administration, the disguised briberies like those of the Credit Mobilier; that it carried on a hot war with a host of public and

private corruptions; that it helped to develop the "independent voter" from an unknown quantity to the decisive make-weight between parties; that it illustrated how to be at once critical and hopeful, exacting and optimistic; that it won its widest abuse and highest respect, and most fully showed itself a type and forerunner of the journalism of the future.

This work of reproof and reform was to Mr. Bowles a congenial service, and brought its high reward,— but it cost him a heavy price. The whole business of criticism and controversy, though he was a master of it, was below his highest powers. By endowment and by training he was more than a critic; he had in him much of the seer. Of his writing, that which will be read longest is not his vigorous controversy, but his portrayal of the new West. In dealing with social forces he was eager for positive, constructive achievement; he longed to open new fields of human happiness, to enlarge the lives of men and women. To hunt out wrong and fight it to the death, was a necessity; to spread "sweetness and light," beauty and order, was a delight; and destiny often assigned to him the harder task. The lash that fell on the wrong-doer hurt also the innocent family and friends. Every rebuke to the Republican party was resented as a personal injury by a host of honest partisans. Every criticism on the Church was a grievance to many Christians. Not only particular strictures thus wounded, and in the reaction brought pain to the critic, but the whole attitude and temper of the *Republican* were widely and profoundly misunderstood. Men called it "ugly," vindictive, and even treacherous. To sometimes blame the party with which, on the whole, one sympathized, and to praise its opponent; to be more anxious to correct faults in one's own household than in a stranger's; to say sharp things of a politician who was the editor's friend; to

expose a wrong involving innocent friends of the culprit in its shame; to be as regardless of personal considerations in speaking from the editor's chair as if it were the judge's bench,— all this was to many good people incomprehensible and scandalous. Nor was the paper always exempt from just blame. Its editor was very human, and had by no means yet attained to the "just men made perfect." But he paid without grudging the price which every reformer must pay.

After 1868, the year of Johnson's impeachment and Grant's election, questions of national politics lost the overshadowing importance which for twenty years had belonged to them. Local interests came again to the front. States and towns became more interested in their domestic housekeeping than in the Federal Administration. The battles of the *Republican* for some years were fought largely on local and personal issues. It began to sharply push the new reforms during the campaign of 1868, while it was still, as for four years afterward, an habitual supporter of the Republican party. It was in this campaign that it came out in vigorous opposition to General Butler. Butler had won popularity in the war by dramatic strokes, which tickled the popular fancy, and made the crowd forgetful of his egregious failures in the field, and indifferent to the graver imputations of personal dishonesty. It was he who early found the desired pretext for a refusal to return slaves who had escaped to the Union camps, by classing them among articles "contraband of war." He ruled conquered New Orleans with a showy vigor which delighted the North. The insults of its women to his soldiery he stopped by a single order the brutal menace of which was never meant to be enforced. After the draft riots had been put down in New York, he was sent there to hold the mob in terror. Entering Congress at the close of the war, he became the

spokesman of the uppermost passions of the passing hour. He was a Radical of the Radicals. None could equal him in vituperation. In the impeachment of Johnson he took a leading part. He won high favor with the class in whom the anti-Southern feeling was a ruling passion, while his total lack of real conviction left him free to take advantage of every popular whim. In 1868 the war debt was making its burden felt, and Butler was fertile in propositions for evading its full payment,—by taxing the bonds, contrary to express stipulation, or by paying them in an unredeemable currency. On the one hand he courted the old anti-slavery men, on the other the unthinking and irresponsible mob—and won them both. He was not allowed a reëlection to Congress in 1868 without protest within the party. R. H. Dana, Jr., was an independent Republican nominee against him, with Judge Otis P. Lord as the unaggressive Democratic candidate. A few courageous men forced the fighting. General George H. Gordon—successor in the field to a subordinate of Butler who was removed at Grant's request because of illicit trading within his department—brought forward weighty evidence that Butler had had a personal interest in the supply, at enormous profits, of provisions to Lee's army at Petersburg, when the whole struggle was turning on the cutting off of its supplies. General Hawley came out against him on the ground of his financial heresies. The New York *Nation*, economists like Edward Atkinson, and a few men who united sagacity with courage, fought him steadily. But most of the Republican politicians and newspapers were friendly to him. Although a risky and inconvenient ally, he was valued as a whip to lash the opposition in Congress. He was personally feared as no other politician has been feared in our day. He was a vindictive and unscrupulous foe; his memory was a great arsenal of

facts which could be used as missiles; he never grudged a lie, and his aim was deadly.

The *Republican* opposed him vigorously on the ground of his "notorious and conceded uncertainty and infidelity in public life." It pressed steadily the main point,—his utter want of political principle. It declared (October 24) that the Republican leaders like Sumner and Claflin know well "how unscrupulous is Butler in public and private, how dangerous his ambition, how malignant his hatred, how dastardly his attack." "Mr. Dawes, Mr. Boutwell, Mr. Bird, and the editors of the Boston newspapers, the editors of the *Independent* and *Tribune*, the leaders of Republican opinion everywhere, know it, and yet they support him! Can anything be more fatal to the stability of an honest party than such collusion with a dishonest adventurer? Can anything be worse for the country than the elevation of such men to high office?" Even "Warrington" was at this time half-favorable to Butler,—being careless of the financial issue, sympathetic with Butler's causticity and radicalism, and hostile to such critics as the *Nation*, Atkinson, and Dana. The sober, scientific, matter-of-fact tone of the new school of reformers was very uncongenial to the emotional and passionate temper of the old anti-slavery men. The crowd was with Butler. He had it all his own way at the election. Dana received less than 2000 votes, Lord had only double that number, and Butler 13,000.

The *Republican's* next encounter was with a commercial adventurer in New York. James Fisk, Jr., and Jay Gould had gained control of the Erie Railway, and were using its securities as gambling tools in a series of daring and unscrupulous speculations, in which they enriched themselves at the expense not only of other speculators, but of the share-holders in the company, and that wide public which is indirectly affected by the

fluctuations of the stock-market. Of the two schemers, Fisk was the coarser and shallower. He flaunted his personal immoralities in the face of the public, and met his death finally in a quarrel which grew out of a low intrigue. He had lately for the first time drawn general attention to himself by the extent and unscrupulousness of his operations, which were facilitated by the aid of eminent lawyers, corrupt courts, and the general demoralization of New York under the rule of the Tweed ring. The *Republican* (November 28, 1868) gave a graphic and truthful biography of this "New Hero of Wall Street," describing his ascent from a Vermont peddler to a railroad king, and the nature of his present operations. Of these, it said:

"Nothing so audacious, nothing more gigantic in the way of real swindling, has ever been perpetrated in this country; and yet it may be that Mr. Fisk and his associates have done nothing that they cannot legally justify, at least in the New York courts, several of which they seem wholly to own."

The closing sentences were these:

"Erie's hero of the hour stands in a precarious position; he has great capacity, now great wealth, certainly great notoriety; all these he can make most useful to himself and the country; it is a pity they should be wasted in destruction alike of character and of values, when the country needs them all, and will reward them all so generously, in measures of construction. Many even of his friends predict for him the state-prison or the lunatic asylum; his father is already in the latter; but we shall hope and believe that he will escape them both, and win a more honorable fame than now gathers over him."

Fisk responded to this invitation to mend his ways by bringing a libel suit against the *Republican* for fifty thousand dollars. He brought similar suits at the same time against the New York *Tribune*, *Times*, and *World*.

His case against the *Republican* was withdrawn from a Massachusetts court, and presented in one of the New York courts. There it was soon abandoned by the plaintiff, but it gave the opportunity for a stroke of personal revenge against the paper's editor. While Mr. Bowles was in New York in the latter part of December, a writ was issued against his person by the notorious Judge McCunn; he was arrested in the corridor of the Fifth Avenue Hotel, and, without seeing his wife, was hurried off to the Ludlow street jail, where he was confined through the night. His friends who hastened to the jail were not allowed to see him that evening. One of them succeeded in finding the sheriff at a convivial party where Fisk, McCunn, and their boon companions of the Tammany faction were assembled to celebrate the election of Mayor Hall. The sheriff evaded the application for an order of release, and shuffled himself out of the way. The next morning a host of friends poured in upon the prisoner; he was released on bail, and there, in a legal sense, the matter ended. It made a wide sensation. Mr. Bowles wrote a vivid and humorous account of his night's experiences. The press in general was swift to resent the affront put upon one of its leading representatives. The significance of the incident was the illustration it gave of how far the judicial and administrative machinery of the metropolis was at the service of a set of gamblers, and could be used by them even to gratify a freak of personal malice. The indignity to Mr. Bowles was made the occasion of an offer to him of a complimentary dinner in Boston; the invitation bearing such names as Bullock, Claflin, Dana, Banks, Motley, Devens, Josiah Quincy, Dr. Howe, and Judge Abbott. Mr. Bowles declined the banquet, and in his reply made some characteristic remarks as to the duties of critical journalism.

"Recent corruptions," he wrote, "threaten to put the control of the government and the value of many kinds of property at the mercy of political adventurers and worthless stock-gamblers. The Press seems to be the best if not the only instrument with which honest men can fight these enemies of order and integrity in government and security in property. I know it is often crude in its reports and careless in its comments; these evils must and will be corrected with its growth,— and, compared with its future, American journalism is now but in its feeblest infancy; — but we have more to fear at present from its good-nature, from its subserviency, from its indifference, from its fear to encounter provocation and loss of patronage by the exposure of the wrong and the exposition of the right. A courageous independence and integrity of purpose, coupled with a fearless expression of truth as to all public individuals, corporations, and parties, are the features in its character to be most encouraged now. We can be patient with crudeness, even with a degree of recklessness, if we can have these other and necessary qualities in vigorous exercise. . . . My own observation is that the Press rarely does injustice to a thoroughly honest man or cause. It may be deceived in regard to a private individual, and misrepresent him for a time; but with reference to public men and measures its knowledge is more intimate and complete than that of any other agency possibly can be; and I know that it withholds unjustly to the public one hundred times, where it speaks wrongly once of the individual."

In the anti-Butler fight, the *Nation*, of New York, which came into existence in 1865, had been conspicuous, and the vials of wrath were opened on its head by the friends of the victor. The *Republican*, coming to the defense of its ally, gave its estimate of the *Nation*. There was a curious likeness and unlikeness between the two papers; in temper and in style they were almost antipodal; yet in fundamental principles there was a close resemblance, and they were generally to be found on the same side of public questions. Said the *Republican:*

"The *Nation* has become a permanent and proud addition to American journalism. Often conceited and priggish; coldly critical to a degree sometimes amusing, and often provoking; and singularly lacking, not only in a generous enthusiasm of its own, but in any sympathy with that great American quality, by which alone we as a people are led on to our efforts and our triumphs in the whole arena of progress; the paper yet shows such vigor and integrity of thought, such moral independence of party, such elevation of tone, and such wide culture, as to demand our great respect and secure our hearty praise. It is the one contribution to American journalism of the last ten years; and happy may the profession call itself if every decade shall offer another gift so positive and so progressive. The *Nation* may not ever be popular in the common American sense; popular as the New York *Ledger*, or the Boston *Journal*, or even the New York *Tribune* is; as a sort of moral policeman of our society, our politics, and our art, it can hardly expect to be; but it assuredly has been and will be most useful. In the great necessity and duty of the time, the reformation of the administration of our government, the substitution of competence for incompetence, of integrity for corruption, it is laboring with noble zeal and telling influence, and is worthy of every patriot's praise."

Two years later, in the beginning of 1871, the *Republican's* comments on the course of the eminent lawyers employed by Fisk and Gould to sustain in the courts their management of the Erie Railroad, led to a notable correspondence between David Dudley Field and his son, Dudley Field, and Mr. Bowles. The senior Field was one of the foremost leaders of the New York bar. With his business partners, including his son, he had been largely employed by the Erie directors in suits relative to their management of the road, while that management was in its general features utterly subversive of equity and the public interest. The New York correspondent of the *Republican* severely

criticised these lawyers for putting their services at the command of public enemies. The Fields, father and son, wrote to Mr. Bowles in sharp resentment of these strictures. Mr. Bowles wrote in reply, justifying and reiterating the criticism. The letters ran on to the number of twenty, with increasing heat and very skillful sword-play on both sides. Finally, of course, they were given to the public, through pamphlets and then through the newspapers. They occasioned great remark. Nothing attracts the crowd's interest like a fight, whether the combatants be two dogs or a Napoleon and Wellington. In this battle of words each warrior found a foeman worthy of his steel. It would have been hard to find two abler controversialists than Bowles and the elder Field, and each of them had a "hearted cause." The facts which gave occasion for the debate — the wrecking of the Erie company, the facilities afforded to such operations by the New York courts, and the general demoralization of the city's affairs under the Tweed régime — had already attracted the widest attention. Along with the personalities of the quarrel were involved general principles of the highest interest, and some questions of morals as to which the general conscience is yet feeling its way doubtfully. That the debate helped to clear up some of these questions constituted its service to the public. As the letters are read now, they are too personal and too combative to afford much contribution to permanent literature save as historical illustration. On the general grounds of controversy, the advantage lay with Mr. Bowles. The first issue presented was the claim of the Fields that their conduct as lawyers in the courts was a private and not a public matter, and no proper subject for the animadversions of a newspaper. On this point Mr. Bowles may be said to have had an easy victory. Such a claim could not stand for a moment

in an age of newspapers; it involved a denial of that moral censorship of the press over all matters of public moment, which has been challenged in turn by each privileged caste,— rulers, clergy, lawyers, physicians,— and challenged in vain. Mr. Bowles rested his justification here on no narrow grounds.

"Of course, I cannot accept the limitations which you put upon journalism. The gathering and publication of *facts* is but one part of its vocation. To express *opinions* is a higher and larger share of its duties. The conduct of public men, before the public, is the legitimate subject of its discussion. The lawyer before the court, as the minister in his pulpit, the executive in his chair of state, and the legislator in his hall of assembly,— all these are alike public men, and their conduct in their public vocations is the proper theme of both journalistic report and discussion."

The issue mainly debated was, whether the Fields had transgressed good morals in their connection with the Erie suits. This, of course, involved a question of fact and a question of principle — what they had done, and what a lawyer may rightly do. On the question of fact the Fields had this advantage of position, that they were thoroughly conversant with the details of intricate transactions, of which their opponent had only general and hearsay knowledge. They could, therefore, deny certain particulars, and challenge him to produce definite and detailed facts in support of his broad allegations. Mr. Bowles would not let himself be drawn into the field of details, where he would have been at such hopeless disadvantage; he fell back on general statements, backed by public report; and in this respect his adversaries gained a certain superiority. Such a superiority is generally decisive before a court of law; but in this case the public had its own well-grounded conviction upon the general features of the Erie lawsuits; and the specifica-

tions in detail were furnished in other newspapers and the quarterlies, by men like Barlow and Adams. On the question of principle — as to what a lawyer may rightly do for his client — the Fields had a consistent theory: in substance, that he may do whatever the law allows him to do. To this Mr. Bowles had no definite theory to oppose; for the limitations which should in the interest of morality be placed on this broad claim have never been and probably cannot be reduced to an exact formula. But that there is a moral limitation — that when a knave hires a lawyer, just as he might hire a horse, to help him in forwarding injurious schemes, the public conscience is shocked, even though the statute be not broken — this view Mr. Bowles urged with an eloquence to which the events of the time gave irresistible effect. Perhaps the best summing up on his part is contained in an editorial, at the time when the letters were printed in the *Republican*, January 30, 1871:

"The great mistake of Mr. Field, as that of his defenders, in this controversy is, that they wholly ignore the moral element in all these questions. . . . Here is the law, they say, here are the courts, and here are the lawyers, — scientific machinery which civilization has set up to determine the conflicting rights of its citizens; and whatever this machinery accords to Mr. Field and Mr. Fisk, they are entitled to, and nobody has the right to dispute the integrity of the verdict. Even if Mr. Fisk seizes somebody else's property, and by Mr. Field's help is able to hold on to it, it is not to be presumed that the judges or jurors would grant it to him unless it really belonged to him — and when they have so granted it, the question is settled. The idea that courts may be bribed, or that the very forms of law, fashioned to protect innocence and to prescribe rights, may be so twisted as to do the opposite, is ignored, or supposed to be impossible, or, if admitted as a possibility, is to be regarded as one of the incidents or aberrations of an exact science, to be submitted to as we submit to the operations of planetary move-

ments, or to too much drought, or too much rain in the grand healthy progress of nature.

"Now, if the law *is* an exact science like geology or mathematics,— if the elements that enter into it and administer it are divine,— if one of Judge Barnard's injunctions is a decree of Providence, and an affidavit from Mrs. Lawler 'a song of the angels,'— if the Court of the Infinite is run by the New York code, and Field and Shearman are entitled to an arrest of judgment against the Ten Commandments,— if, in short, the devil is as good as the average, and the sum of both divine and human wisdom is the French philosophy that no matter what happens, so long as it does not happen to yourself,— all this being so, then these gentlemen are clearly right, Field, Barnard, and Fisk are the victims of unworthy prejudices, and the modern newspaper is indeed a 'public nuisance,' as the junior Field protests. But if human imperfection is to be recognized in law and lawyers,— if we admit the moral element into their work,— if there is such a thing as a private conscience, and a public conscience as well,— they are all wrong, and the journalist's general view in this discussion is the correct one. In this instance the latter may have drawn the lines too broadly and too sharply here and there; but, given the concession of the moral sense in human action, yield to public opinion the right to bring in the Ten Commandments and independent thought to bear upon law and courts and lawyers, and the case is up for Messrs. Field and Fisk and their apologists."

The railroad rings were a principal object of the *Republican's* attack during these years,— an attack as intelligent as it was energetic. On the approaching completion of the Pacific road, of which Mr. Bowles had been so warm an advocate, he discerned the indications of corrupt influences among congressmen in its behalf; and so early as July 25, 1868, in felicitating the managers and the public on the near consummation of the work, he gave warning of the signs of a Pacific railroad ring. Nine months later, the paper said (April 25, 1869): "We

should like to know to what extent the scandals concerning members of Congress having become possessors of shares in the company without paying any money for them, is true." In fact, as appeared four years afterward, the distribution of "Credit Mobilier" stock among members had already begun. But for the present it was chiefly in Massachusetts that the paper was combating schemes against the public treasury. For many years the Hoosac Tunnel enterprise had been making a series of successful applications for state aid,— to the heavy increase of the state debt, and with very small ultimate returns. The end was reached by an appropriation by the legislature of 1868 of $5,000,000, with which the governor was to contract and did contract for the completion of the tunnel. Meanwhile, by this frequent voting of railroad supplies, a knot of men of the pot-house politician stripe had come to find habitual employment for themselves at the State-house, as go-betweens for the corporations which wanted legislative votes, and legislators who had votes to give. The practice of these lobbyists was, when some scheme of appropriation was under debate, to bargain with the officers of the applying corporation for a sum,— perhaps of one or two thousand dollars,— to be paid to them in case the measure succeeded. What means they used to promote its success, the corporation's representatives took care not to inquire too closely. Of actual purchase of votes there was probably but little. The lobbyists traded on the pretense of more power than they really had. Now and then a vote might be bought outright; far oftener an exchange of votes was negotiated between members interested in different measures; and legislators were conciliated by convivial hospitalities. There was a well-known room of which liquors, cards, and coarse good-fellowship were the attractions, and with these instru-

mentalities members were reached directly or indirectly. The whole business was little known to the general public until the *Republican* came out in strong attack upon it, June 15, 1868. "The Lobby at Home" was pictured and denounced in an editorial; while in the same paper a Boston letter gave many particulars, naming and describing the leading lobbyists and specifying the measures which they had influenced. This was followed up in the paper from time to time, until the attack could no longer be ignored. The legislature of 1869 took up the matter and appointed a committee of investigation, in a spirit rather of resentment against the *Republican* than of concern as to the charges; and the committee made a very mild report. One specific case of bribery in the previous session was carried into the courts, and the *Republican* was active in bringing it to light. But the publicity given to the matter was enough to break down an association which had never had any strength comparable to that of the lobbies at Washington, Albany, and Harrisburg. The gross and open forms of legislative corruption disappeared.

But the pushing of dishonest and mischievous railroad schemes in the legislature was by no means at an end. Their promoters sought support less by the coarse expedient of paying legislators for their votes than through the judicious sale of stocks and bonds to men holding influential relations with the press or the state government. The most conspicuous of these plunderers was the Hartford and Erie Railroad Company. This corporation had been established to build a railroad between Boston and Fishkill-on-the-Hudson, which was ultimately completed under another organization. In its early years the company passed under the control of a set of men whose object was not to make a railroad but to make money by the shorter process of getting it voted out of

the Massachusetts treasury into their own pockets. In 1867 the company had obtained from the state a conditional loan of $3,000,000, under stipulations which effectually guarded the state's interest. So effectually was it guarded, and by so little genuine work did the road entitle itself to aid, that in two years only one-fifth of this sum was paid over to it. Toward the end of the session of 1869, a bill was introduced which in effect swept away all safeguards, and increased the loan from three to five millions on a coin basis, equivalent to six or seven millions of currency. This bill the *Republican* opposed. But it was hurried through both Houses by large majorities and was signed by the governor. The company speedily got and spent most of the money; there was scant work to show for it; the stock and bonds were worth little; and the managers prepared for a fresh raid on the legislature.

In the meantime, economical questions were on all sides coming to the front. The *Republican* pointed out (September 11, 1869) that the state debt had been increased by one-third since the war, and the annual expense of the state government doubled. It called on the Republicans to make retrenchment a leading issue. In the same month Fisk and Gould made a great "corner" in Wall street, and swept millions into their pockets. The scandal of "Black Friday" involved near friends and connections of the President, though General Grant was cleared of all complicity. As the spring of 1870 came on, the *Republican* said, March 8: "Values are shrinking and fortunes are crumbling, and there is one universal outcry all over the country for a reduction of taxation"; yet here is a set of men, begging five or six millions more, for the Hartford and Erie! Then followed a sharp and obstinate contest. Of the Boston papers, only the *Herald* was uncompromising and vigor-

ous against any further aid to the road. Outside of Boston every newspaper except one was opposed to any further grants. In personal opposition to the bill, F. W. Bird was conspicuous; on the same side were John M. Forbes, Alpheus Hardy, and James Freeman Clarke, and many good men in the legislature. The result in the legislature was a compromise: no more money to be paid out, but the securities held by the state for past advances to be given up in exchange for almost worthless second-mortgage bonds;—in effect, said the *Republican*, giving the road at least $2,000,000, perpetuating the stock of an insolvent corporation for purely speculative purposes, and playing into the hands of men who have ruined the road and disgraced the state. The paper was extremely able in its opposition to the whole business; its exposition of the facts was full and clear, its comments trenchant and just. It was the recognized leader of the opposition press. When the bill went to Governor Claflin for his signature, and immense local influence was brought to bear on him in its favor, the *Republican* called on him for a veto, in an editorial only a quarter of a column long, a model of condensed argument, appeal, and warning. The governor returned the bill with a message calm and weighty; recognizing the desirability of the proposed line of railroad,—yet, he wrote, "great as are the advantages, they are not to be counted for a moment, if the state is to be disgraced by silent acquiescence in the course of deception, peculation, and fraud, practiced by the managers of the company." That was the end of state aid to the Hartford and Erie, which was shortly thereafter sold out under foreclosure, and reorganized as the New York and New England. Since then, repeated but unsuccessful applications in its behalf have been made to the state, and balked of success only by the energetic hostility of papers like the *Republican*. But

with the establishment of a railroad commission and a general railroad law, came a great diminution of special legislation and the attendant corruption.

In the general course of state politics, little of salient interest occurred from 1868 until 1871. In the former year, on the retirement of Governor Andrew's successor, Governor Bullock, after three years of creditable service, William Claflin was elected, and administered the government honorably and well for three terms. There was a political lull, in state and nation, compared with the excitement which preceded and followed. In Massachusetts the calm was effectually broken when in 1871 Butler sought the Republican nomination for governor. He had kept himself well before the country as a restless agitator. His sources of popular strength were many. The ignorant were captivated by promises large and vague; the devotees of special reforms were caught by fair words,— cheap currency which the utterer never dreamed of redeeming. He won largely, too, from among that great mass of well-disposed men who lack the intelligence to comprehend abstract questions, or to read character closely, and whose imagination is impressed by a man of vivid and striking personality. In his personal relations he showed many agreeable and winning qualities. He was warm-blooded, audacious, quick-witted, capable of generosity and of stanch friendship. He stimulated a perpetual curiosity as to what he would do next. The crowd are drawn to a man who makes politics as entertaining as a play. Many Americans find in politics the amusement and stimulus which other peoples find in theaters and beer-gardens. They crave excitement and dramatic interest in their politics; and when there is no great question like that of slavery and war, they are attracted by a sensational performer like Butler; he amuses them and finally wins them.

Besides this multitude, he found in almost every community men with some capacity for management or leadership, whom he could secure as his lieutenants, to receive his whispered orders, carry out his plans, and share the glory and spoils of his victory. It is by a not wholly ignoble feeling that men like a master in some such way as a dog does,— somebody to obey, to believe in, to follow through thick and thin. By finding out and organizing such personal followers, Butler won much of his success. But the agency which was indispensable to his victories was the support of one or the other of the great party organizations. When he had once, by whatever means, become the "regular candidate," thousands who personally disliked him fell dutifully into line. It was as the regular Republican candidate that he won all his elections to Congress; it was as the regular Democratic candidate that he at last — beyond the period of our story — became governor.

His advance upon the governorship in 1871 awoke an opposition among the Republican party such as he had not before encountered. The campaign which ended in the convention in September was sharply fought. The long tolerance given to Butler by the party leaders had weakened their hands when they at last turned against him. A good specimen of his methods of work was given in Springfield. When the Republicans of the city held their caucus to choose delegates to the convention, Butler was on the ground and organized his forces during the day. At the caucus in the City Hall, his partisans gained the control by high-handed and irregular methods; there was great tumult; the use of the check-list as a protection against fraud was voted, but was almost ignored; although twelve hundred votes were cast, only a hundred and twenty names were checked; and in the majority by which Butler delegates

were elected there were hundreds of votes cast by Democrats. In other towns there were similar scenes and a similar result.

Mr. Bowles returned from a summer in Europe to take the helm of the *Republican*. Under his control, the tone of the paper was energetic and denunciatory, but never beyond the limits of fair warfare. Among the most serviceable opponents of Butler at this time was "Warrington." Mr. Bowles was active in rallying the party chiefs to the fight. He drew from Mr. Dawes, on his way home from the West, a telegram saying that Butler's success would be a national calamity and a disgrace to the state. The *Republican* published this statement, September 21:

"We have seen Senator Sumner and Senator Wilson personally, and are authorized to say that they deeply regret and deplore the extraordinary canvass which General Butler has precipitated on the commonwealth, and especially the attacks which he has volunteered against the existing state government and the Republican party of Massachusetts. In their opinion his nomination as governor would be hostile to the best interests of the commonwealth and of the Republican party."

Among the foremost workers for Butler were such leading Federal officials as United States Marshal Usher and Collector Russell. When the convention met at Worcester, September 27, the anti-Butler forces had united upon William B. Washburn of Greenfield, Governor Claflin having declined a renomination. Among their leaders were the Hoar brothers, Dawes, Rice, Whittier, and "Warrington." George F. Hoar presided; General Butler led his own forces in the convention; Mr. Dawes led the opposition. The ballot gave 643 votes for Washburn and 464 for Butler. It was a victory, but a victory ominous for the future.

At the election in November, Washburn had 27,000 more votes than his Democratic opponent, John Quincy Adams. The Republicans carried New York by 30,000 majority, and that result completed the overthrow of the Tweed rule in state and city. The revolt of the people against Tweed and Tammany began in the summer before, when the *Times* made its detailed disclosures of the ring's robberies,— perhaps the greatest single service to the public ever rendered by an American newspaper. The course of national politics requires a separate chapter.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Grant's First Administration.

"IT was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way."

To some such characterization as Dickens applies to another period may the student be impelled who shall hereafter read the various utterances when Grant's first administration was drawing to a close. It is easy wisdom even at the distance of a dozen years to see that the situation was neither so very good nor so very bad as it appeared to most of the actors and contestants.

The nation was adapting itself to a change in its political conditions, the magnitude of which it required a long time for the mass of citizens to comprehend. General Grant was called to the head of affairs just as the transition period was setting in. It would have required statesmanship of a high order to comprehend and guide the many conflicting elements of the old and new. Of his capacity for civil government almost nothing was known, but much was hoped. In the qualities he had shown in the war,—the power to direct vast material forces, the wisdom in selecting his lieutenants, the unerring instinct for the end to be sought, and the

inflexible resolution in pursuing it,— in these, together with his magnanimity in victory, his freedom from false ambition, and the modesty and simplicity with which he had borne his honors,—there seemed to be such qualifications for the presidential office as might make good his lack of civil experience. It must be accounted his misfortune that he was called — not by his own seeking — to occupy for eight years a most conspicuous position for which he proved to be qualified neither by endowment nor by training. It was under the later ordeal of misfortune and suffering that he won back his place in the esteem of his countrymen. His fame will rest scarcely at all on his political career. He will be honored because his generalship saved the nation's life, and because he was a type of the soldierly virtues,— obedience, courage, and will.

He undertook the greatest business in the country, the Presidency, without having served any apprenticeship in civil administration or legislation. He was not only without experience and without study in the art of civil government; he had lacked that taste for politics which seems the birthright of every American. After his West Point education and a brief military service, he retired to private life, so indifferent to public interests that it was said that, during all the great years which led up to the war, he did not even vote, except to cast a ballot for Buchanan because he disliked Fremont. The war had trained him in soldiership, but in nothing else. No man, unless it was General Taylor, ever came to the Presidency so unacquainted with the whole theory of our political system. Mr. Schurz's remark upon him in 1872 was a justifiable one: "I doubt if it has ever been quite clear to his own mind what the Presidency means in our system of government." On all subjects which he understood, his mind acted with clearness and force. Whenever

as President he had to deal with a special topic on which he had knowledge, and was without personal bias, he often handled it admirably. But his ignorance of the broad theory and art of statesmanship left him very much at the mercy of his advisers, and the sagacity with which he had chosen his subordinates in the field deserted him in the cabinet. In the Presidency, as in the war, he showed a tenacious, dogged will, and a certain massive force, which carried him far toward his ends. Morally, there was in him an honesty and trustworthiness which the people always recognized and respected. Through the whole of his military career he had shown the kind of self-abnegation which is inculcated by the soldier's ideal and the soldier's training. He obeyed orders and did his duty just as faithfully when he was ignored or overruled as when he was in supreme command. In assuming the Presidency, he entered a sphere with whose ideals and traditions he was wholly unfamiliar. He was assiduously courted by men who taught him to look upon the Presidency as a reward which he had earned by his services, and of which he was to use the powers and emoluments according to his personal pleasure. He was betrayed into a habitual egotism of thought and action which clouded the modesty and simplicity of his earlier character. He often seemed to look on the Presidency as a reward bestowed for his personal merits and services, and which he might use to reward his friends and punish his enemies.

His first act as President gave evidence of a purpose to act independently, but also of want of acquaintance with political usage. While he was choosing his cabinet, he maintained an entire secrecy and an abstinence from the usual consultations with the party chiefs, which rather pleased the popular feeling, weary of cabals and intrigues. But when he announced his cabinet appoint-

ments, it was evident that he had been guided by personal fancy rather than an intelligent political principle. For Secretary of the Treasury, he named A. T. Stewart, a man who had been wholly unconnected with public life, and was known only as the most successful of New York merchants; a man, too, who was at once known to be legally ineligible to the place, on account of his occupation in commerce. On learning this, the President asked Congress to exempt Mr. Stewart from the statute,— an illustration that he had scarcely learned that ours is "a government of laws and not of men." He was obliged to withdraw the nomination. To the Secretaryship of State he appointed Mr. E. B. Washburne, of Illinois, his personal friend and an able man, but to whom he gave the place purely as a compliment, to be instantly exchanged for the French mission. As Secretary of the Navy he named a rich Philadelphian without qualification for the position, who received it with surprise, and before long resigned it. Of the other cabinet offices, some were well filled at the start; in others, original mistakes were repaired; and during his first administration the President's official council, while here and there very weak, was on the whole of respectable character. Hamilton Fish was an excellent Secretary of State; Mr. Boutwell in the Treasury was an energetic rather than a wise financier; Judge Hoar was a capable Attorney-general; and Mr. Cox in the Interior Department showed "the spirit and intelligence of reform"— a phrase coined in another application by Mr. Dawes — so long as he was allowed to retain his position. Mr. Robeson administered the Navy Department with scandalous extravagance; General Belknap, a special friend of the President, was at the head of the War Department; and Mr. Creswell, of Maryland, was Postmaster-general. The President's minor appointments were a mixture of good, bad, and

indifferent. On the whole, the executive business of the government was fairly well administered, judged by the standard of former administrations.

The result of President Grant's initial attempt at extreme independence of action taught him that his new position was at the center of an extremely complicated machine, and that he must rely largely on those who were already familiar with its workings. He accepted the lesson promptly. He was too little acquainted with public life and politicians to choose his advisers very wisely, but about him were a large group of men who had come to the front during the eight years of Republican ascendency. In taking his councilors and his instruments from the prominent party chiefs, he could not well miss getting some shrewd heads and strong hands. But when he had chosen his ministers and his chief subordinates, his personal contribution to the government of the country was almost at an end, save on rare occasions. His weaknesses were fostered by advisers who in fawning on him served their own ends. He was strong in his likes and dislikes, a faithful friend and a stanch foe. But often his friends were badly chosen. He became intolerant of personal opposition; his tastes did not attract him to men on the ground of high aims or generous culture; he was accessible to flatterers and parasites. He had some friends of a far higher class, irreproachable, like Senator Edmunds and Judge Hoar; but in the long run it was the coarse sort that influenced him. To offer him a direct bribe would have been dangerous, but he saw no reason against his receiving gifts, or liking and favoring the givers. So long as he did not knowingly put knavery or rank incompetence into office, it was sufficient reason for an appointment that the appointee was his relative or his friend. In the large matters of government he followed with small question

the advice of the congressmen or officials who had won his liking. Thus it came about that he was very much under the influence, in minor matters, of a little clique of inferior military officers who were his companions at the White House, and in large affairs of a knot of senatorial chiefs of the Republican party. In Grant's first administration, the control of the party came to lie largely with a few senators, conspicuous among whom were Morton, Conkling, Carpenter, Sherman, Cameron, Zachariah Chandler, and Edmunds. It was by these men and their congressional associates that broad questions of government were mostly controlled. The executive departments were administered by their respective chiefs almost without interference or influence from the President, save when the personal interests of his friends or allies were concerned. Upon the whole, his services as President, in his first term, were characterized with as much fairness as an epigram allows, when the *Republican* said of him (November 24, 1871), "He has sat by and seen the country tolerably well governed."

The first two years of his administration were on the whole a period of tranquillity and content. To the turmoils and alarms of Johnson's presidency there succeeded a time of stability and peace. The formal reconstruction of the South was completed by the admission to Congress, in the first months of 1870, of the representatives of Virginia, Mississippi, Texas, and Georgia. The Fifteenth Amendment, forbidding exclusion from the suffrage on the ground of race, received the two assents wanting for its ratification from the Republican legislatures of Texas and Mississippi. Except in the South it was a time of general prosperity. Interest was in considerable degree transferred from Washington to state and local affairs. In comparison with the preceding period, there had set in an intermission of the over-

shadowing importance of national politics. Grant's pithy saying, "Let us have peace," expressed the popular feeling, and the desire seemed to have found fulfillment.

To most minds, so lately excited by the danger of national dismemberment, such evils and corruptions as now existed seemed rather trivial. But while the country had been absorbed and convulsed by the questions of slavery and war, the general methods of public business had suffered a great deal of neglect. The beginning of Grant's administration brought into sharp relief a long-ripening mischief — the apportioning of appointments by the executive among the party congressmen as patronage to be distributed by favor among their constituents. The partisan civil-service system dated back to Jackson; the reference of minor appointments to the local congressmen had become systematic under Lincoln; and Grant only followed established precedent;— practically he had no alternative. But the result in the character of many of his appointments disappointed the unreasonably high expectations with which the country was watching him. The *Republican* referred this disappointment to its true cause, May 8, 1869:

> "The fault of these appointments has been in the vicious and absurd rule which makes them the gift of congressmen to their constituents — for this is really what the congressional disposal of patronage amounts to."

From this time dates a growing effort for a radical reform in the system of appointments — a movement which never aroused much popular enthusiasm, but steadily enlisted the best intelligence of the country, as the patronage system was more and more seen to be the worst obstacle to all political advance. The principle on which the reformers agreed was that the test for all appointments, save those by which the general policy

of the government was molded, should be character and capacity, without regard to party affiliations. The resource to this end which found most favor was a system of competitive examinations. Mr. Jenckes, of Rhode Island, was the pioneer in Congress of this reform, but Congress gave it the cold shoulder. A commission was indeed appointed to provide some measure of reform. Mr. G. W. Curtis was placed at its head by the President, and a set of rules was reported, looking to appointment and promotion by merit in a large class of offices. The report received the President's approval, and the rules were theoretically put in force. But their "suspension" was almost immediately announced—a suspension which proved as final as that of the hangman. Congress showed its hostility to the plan by grudging or refusing the appropriations for the expenses of the commission. The President expressed himself as friendly to the reform, and the profession doubtless was sincere. But his interest was not deep or intelligent enough to sustain him against the wishes of the men about him, who were prompt and effective in their resistance to reforms which cut at the root of their power and profits.

The great and growing vice of Grant's administration was that he was controlled by his personal likes and dislikes on every question which touched his friends or his enemies. The mischief of this increased as the bond strengthened between him and a set of ambitious and intriguing politicians in Congress, and adventurers worked themselves into his confidence, while among some of the purest and wisest of the party leaders there were signs of alienation or opposition.

In one respect, criticism from its friends gained credit, if not for the Administration, yet for the party. In the congressional session of 1869–70, the appropriations asked for the ensuing year by the departments amounted to

$330,000,000. These figures, $30,000,000 more than in the last year of Johnson's administration, came as a surprise and disappointment to the country. Mr. Dawes was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations,—Mr. Blaine having been chosen over him to the speakership, vacated by Vice-President Colfax. On the presentation of the estimates, Mr. Dawes attacked them on the floor of the House, January 18, as excessive, and pledged his committee to cut them down below the figures of the preceding year. The *Republican*, which had declared the first question at Washington to be that of economy, was delighted at so vigorous a stroke by its home member.

"It is the boldest demonstration against narrow-minded partisanship almost ever made in Congress, and a token of the increasing independence of the men of real character and ability in public life. Anybody can denounce the sins of our enemies. There will be plenty of that done. It is more important that the offenses of our friends should be laid bare, that the dangers which they threaten should be exposed,—even that capital should be furnished to our opponents to carry on the warfare against ourselves,—that we may be incited and driven to purify our action, reform our evils, and strengthen our souls."

Mr. Dawes lost all favor at the White House, and Butler seized the occasion to assail him in the House of Representatives. But the House followed the lead of Dawes and of General Schenck. The end of the session showed a reduction in the taxes and tariff of from seventy to eighty millions. Throughout this administration Mr. Dawes stood in the House as the champion of economy. It was in no small degree due to him that so good a financial record could be shown in the country in 1872,—a record which helped to inspire that confidence of the moneyed interest which greatly contributed to Grant's reëlection.

The third year of Grant's presidency, 1871, was in many respects a critical one. It was marked by the most eminent success of his first administration — the Treaty of Washington. The Civil War had left in the victors a sense of injury at the hands of England. The substantial wrong alleged was that vessels designed for Confederate cruisers had been allowed to sail from English ports, contrary to the obligations of international law and against the protests of the American minister. Back of this complaint lay a feeling that the government and the ruling class of England had been friendly at heart to the Southern Confederacy, and had expressed that disposition by hastening within the first month of the war to recognize it as a belligerent power, as well as by various subsequent acts. The moral grievance of the North was that the mother country, or at least its governing class, had failed to sympathize with its struggle for national life and for universal liberty. As to the material complaint, the English answer was that the government had exercised a reasonable vigilance toward the suspected vessels; and as to the question of sympathies, it was urged that the American government had for a long time carefully disclaimed waging a war for emancipation, while the South's watchword of independence appealed not unnaturally to a nation generally inclined to sympathize with all rebels except its own.

The unsettled "Alabama claims" — so called from the most famous of the cruisers, whose destruction at last in fair fight by the "Kearsarge" was to the North one of the most joyful incidents of the war — remained a focus for whatever ill feeling existed between the two peoples. There was a manifest disposition in the United States, in case no settlement could be obtained, to await an opportunity for reprisals when England should next be engaged in a war. Early in 1868, Gladstone, Bright, Foster, and

Shaw-Lefèvre spoke in the House of Commons in favor of an amicable arbitration upon the claims. About this time Mr. Adams retired by his own desire from the English mission, and was succeeded by Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, an eminent lawyer. Mr. Johnson met with a most friendly reception, and early in 1869 he negotiated a treaty with Lord Clarendon, Foreign Secretary of the Gladstone ministry. This treaty provided that all claims against either country by citizens of the other since 1853 should be referred to a commission, of which two members were to be appointed by each government, and the four were to agree on a fifth as umpire, or to refer mooted questions to the head of a friendly state. The treaty was scarcely judged on its own merits in the United States. The warmth of Mr. Johnson's social relations in England, extending to the class which had been most unfriendly to this country, had roused hostility to him at home. His record as a Democrat, though a conservative one, and his relation to the hated administration of Andrew Johnson, told against his work; and the treaty was speedily and almost scornfully rejected by the Senate.

Early in 1871, the whole question was taken in hand by the administrations of Grant and of Gladstone. It was treated on both sides with directness, frankness, and friendliness. The preliminary negotiation had almost the brevity of a conversation. Sir Edward Thornton, British minister at Washington, proposed to Secretary Fish, on behalf of Lord Granville, that certain unsettled questions as to the Canadian fisheries and the Northwestern boundary be referred to a joint commission. Mr. Fish promptly replied that the President approved, on condition that the same commission act on the Alabama claims. Granville rejoined through Thornton: Very good, provided that sundry claims of British subjects for

losses during the war shall also be considered. This Mr. Fish accepted; and, thanks to the ocean cable, the whole negotiation had been accomplished in eight days.

As commissioners the President nominated Secretary Fish, General Schenck,— under appointment as minister to England,—Justice Nelson of the Supreme Court, E. R. Hoar, and George H. Williams. The English commissioners were: Earl de Grey, Sir Edward Thornton, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir John A. McDonald for the Canadians, and Montague Bernard. They met in Washington and discussed for two months the various points in dispute. Naturally the two parties failed to agree as to the merits of almost every topic, and they framed accordingly a series of arbitrations. The fruit of their labors was the Treaty of Washington. It referred the Alabama claims to a commission of which the five members were to be named respectively by the chief rulers of the United States, Great Britain, Switzerland, Italy, and Brazil. For this commission three rules were laid down, giving to the duties of neutrals a somewhat more stringent definition than had been generally conceded. The war claims of British subjects were referred to another board, of which the two governments were to name each one member, and these to agree on a third. A similar board was to pass on the question of compensation due from either country, as a balance for any inequality in the fishery rights which were defined by articles of the treaty. The North-western boundary question was referred to the Emperor of Germany. The preamble of the treaty declared that the Queen's representatives were authorized "to express in a friendly spirit the regret felt by her Majesty's government for the escape, under whatever circumstances, of the "Alabama" and other vessels from British ports and for the depredations committed

by these vessels,"— an expression which without humiliating England, or admitting any wrong-doing, was grateful to American sensibilities.

The treaty met with just the degree of opposition which is the necessary tribute to any large forward step. Zealots grumbled a little on both sides. The familiar taunt of sacrificing British interests was thrown at Gladstone. Butler posed against the treaty as the champion of injured fishermen. The Democrats in the Senate — with the exception of two or three, among whom was Mr. Bayard, the early and firm friend of the arbitration scheme — sank patriotism in partisanship and voted against the treaty, in the blind hope of making capital against the Administration upon what proved to be its most illustrious and popular achievement. The vote upon ratification was fifty to twelve. When in the next year the Geneva tribunal awarded $15,500,000 to the United States, the English people were chafed, as the loser in a lawsuit generally is, and the Gladstone ministry probably lost some supporters. The American government marred its work by putting forward a demand that the tribunal should consider the question of *indirect* damages, including the increase of insurance rates, the expense of pursuing the cruisers, and the prolongation of the war,— a claim which might amount to hundreds of millions, and which the British government justly repudiated as wholly outside of the intent of the treaty. There was a momentary blaze of passion on both sides of the water, and the whole arbitration seemed in jeopardy,— but the commission on its first assembling promptly and unanimously excluded the indirect claims. On the whole, the treaty was nobly carried through; and each government acted as the worthy representative of a great people which at heart desired justice and peace. The war which ended slavery had a fit supplement in a transaction which

led the way toward the abolition in some future age of the other great survival of barbarism.

The domestic situation was far less satisfactory. The seeds of mischief in the South were ripening into harvest. For a year or two following their re-admission, the lately rebellious states lay exhausted, passive, and almost dumb. Then their various troubles forced themselves again on public attention. These communities had been by the congressional re-adjustment placed in a condition of unstable equilibrium. The servile and ignorant class was at the top, the intelligent and master class at the bottom. In giving the suffrage to the entire mass of freedmen a dangerous step had been taken, but under a strong pressure,— the obvious unwillingness of the whites to recognize the civil manhood of their enfranchised slaves. An equally injurious mistake was the exclusion from office of the entire class of accustomed leaders. It was estimated before the partial amnesty of 1872, that 160,000 were thus excluded; men who had held office before the war violated their official oath of allegiance in joining the rebellion,— an inevitable incident of every revolution,— and who were the trusted leaders of their communities. The logical sequel of these measures was the building up at the South, under the inspiration and control of the Republican leaders at Washington, of a party supposed to represent the interests of loyalty and freedom, consisting of the entire body of freedmen, and the few native whites and Northern immigrants who made common cause with them. The honors and emoluments of the Federal offices, and the open favor of the resistless Federal government, gave prestige and temporary success to the Southern Republican party. For a few years it had control of most of the state governments. Among its members and leaders were honorable and able men; among its deeds were some genuine public services. But

the general rule of a party which in its rank and file was densely ignorant, and in its leadership largely alien and largely corrupt, was of necessity a rule of ignorance and corruption. Ruinous taxes were levied; public money was stolen; public interests were neglected. South Carolina, having relatively the largest black population, bore the heaviest load of mismanagement and humiliation. The state of Calhoun, the seat once of the proudest and most brilliant aristocracy, saw its laws enacted by its former slaves, its treasury plundered by Northern adventurers, its industry paralyzed by over-taxation. It had a governor, Moses, who in later years got himself into a Massachusetts prison for obtaining money under false pretenses. The situation was unnatural and could not long continue. Open resistance was impossible. In some quarters relief and revenge were sought through secret organizations designed to terrorize the negroes. There were midnight ridings, cruel abuse of the blacks and their friends, whippings, and murders. Slave society had developed a low and brutal class of whites. There were some who found outlet for an instinctive savagery in terrorizing the negroes. The spirit of caste was shown at its worst by the odium thrown upon the Northern school-teachers among the blacks, although many of them were among the best men and women of the nation. But what won connivance and something of complicity from the higher classes in the abuse of the blacks and their friends, was the desire to weaken by intimidation a political power felt to be alike burdensome and humiliating.

There had not been wanting voices at the North to give early warning against the errors which produced these complications. On the day after the announcement of Lee's surrender, Mr. Greeley in the *Tribune* spoke powerful words, both wise and generous, for amnesty

universal and complete. Governor Andrew, in his valedictory address, January 1, 1866, declared that universal amnesty was the true course. "The capacity of leadership," he said, "is a gift, not a device. Those whose courage, talents, and will entitle them to lead, will lead. We ought to demand and secure the coöperation of the strongest and ablest minds, and the natural leaders of opinion in the South. If we cannot gain their support of the just measures needful for the work of safe reorganization, reorganization will be delusive and full of dangers." The *Republican* had steadily preached the same gospel of wisdom and magnanimity. Even in face of disorders and outrages at the South (August 10, 1868), while testifying against the "madness of reactionary appetite" and the danger which would attend a Democratic victory at the pending election, it deprecated the narrow spirit in which the Republican managers were organizing their Southern allies.

"The Republican party cannot long maintain its supremacy at the South by negro votes alone. The instincts of submission and dependence in them and of domination in the whites, are too strong to permit such a reversal of the familiar relations and the natural order. The slave-holding element has learned to combine, conspire, and command, in the best school on earth, and they will certainly come to the top. Nor is it desirable that such a state of things should be continued."

These predictions of trouble found abundant fulfillment. It was in 1871 that Northern attention was widely roused to the atrocities ascribed to the Kuklux. According to one account, which seems authentic, the society under this name originated in Tennessee in 1866 in a club of young men who at first aimed only at amusement; it spread by a sort of contagious fascination and undertook a kind of regulation of the negroes and the

lower class of whites, on the plea of punishing the petty depredations and disorders incident to the times. It excited alarm and opposition; ran into excesses; was the object of severe legislation in Tennessee under Governor Brownlow; and was formally disbanded, by an order from its chief authority, early in 1869. The subsequent irregularities in various parts of the South, according to this account, were committed by men who appropriated the Kuklux name and some of its machinery of terrorism. The broad fact is that there were secret organizations, which exercised intimidation and violence to keep in subordination the blacks, who in their new freedom often gave offense, sometimes by their lax notion and practice as to rights of property, sometimes by their political action, though much was owing to the indignation of the whites at any assertion of negro equality.

Congress took the matter in hand; passed rigorous laws; investigated and brought to light the magnitude of the evil; gave special powers to the President, and authorized him to suspend the habeas corpus. This recourse to Federal authority drew criticism from some Republicans, but it was generally held that the emergency called for sharp remedies; and the remedies proved not wholly ineffective. In some localities, notably in South Carolina, a check was given to the outrages. The President used the extraordinary powers given him with discretion and moderation. To his action in this respect, and to that of Congress, the *Republican* gave approval.

But the causes of Southern disorder were too deep-rooted to be exterminated by these summary methods, and as to the other class of wrongs, the plundering and corruption of the "carpet-bag" governments, the Administration and the congressional Republicans were wholly passive. They were worse than passive, for it was

patronage and countenance from Washington which gave to the carpet-bag party its coherence and strength. To keep their party in power the Northern Republican leaders had organized for themselves an ally in the South; when their partner proved vicious and disreputable, they were not willing to disown him. It was against this point that the *Republican* directed its severest criticism. It said in April, 1871:

"Of all the mistakes — neither few nor small — of General Grant's Administration, the grand cardinal mistake, so far as the future of the country is concerned, has been his neglect to do anything important for the restoration of good feeling and loyalty at the South. He ought to have promoted amnesty; to have conciliated the majority while protecting the minority; to have had from the first a representative Southern man in the cabinet; and by personal visits to the South to have cultivated the acquaintance of the leaders and won their coöperation."

The fault at this point was due to Grant's failure to take a large view of the situation and his own responsibilities. He left the policy of the government toward the South to be shaped by Congress, and especially by the group of narrow and bitter partisans who were his especial supporters in the Senate. It was they who principally gave whatever of positive character belonged to the treatment of the Southern question.

But there had been an activity in other directions, which was bringing trouble on the Administration and on the country, especially with regard to the proposed annexation of San Domingo. This scheme seems to have had its birth in the projects of some obscure speculators. The President was interested in it through one of his military household; the idea of gaining a military and commercial foothold in the West Indies caught his fancy, and he pushed the attempt with great pertinacity. The orig-

inal negotiation with Baez, President of San Domingo, was conducted not through the State Department, but by General Babcock, a military attaché of General Grant, who pledged to Baez the influence of the Executive for the ratification of the treaty. The treaty was laid before the Senate in 1870, and the President exerted himself strenuously in its favor, by visits to the Capitol, personal persuasion of senators, and offers of patronage. Baez meanwhile was threatened with revolution among his subjects, and Grant sent a strong force of war vessels to defend him against any assaults. The republic of Hayti, coöccupant with San Domingo of the island, was disposed to look askance at the intrusion upon its shores of so powerful a neighbor; and lest it should give trouble to Baez, United States war vessels were sent to Port-au-Prince with a peremptory warning to the Haytian government not to interfere. The spirit of the Constitution was violated by this whole series of acts, and they heightened the disfavor with which the Senate and the country had from the first regarded any beginning of West Indian annexation. The leading opponent of the measure was Senator Sumner. Mr. Sumner's habits of thought and speech had (like those of many other men) received their lasting stamp from the anti-slavery controversy. He assailed the annexation project in such terms as he had been wont to use against "the sum of all villainies." He denounced it as willful usurpation, as military despotism, as an assault on the "Black Republic of Hayti," as an outrage on all rights, divine and human. The violence of the protest lessened its effectiveness. The people knew that Grant was no willful usurper, and to bring such an imputation confused and obscured the real issue. By provoking a personal quarrel, it aggravated the characteristic fault of the Administration,—the disposition to determine public questions by private

considerations. The recall at this time of Mr. Motley, Minister to England, seemed to have no adequate reason, and was attributed by many to a grudge.

San Domingo was laid on the shelf till the session of 1871–72. In the interim there was another conspicuous proof that the President was amenable to evil influences, and that his firmness could not be trusted save when his personal feelings were engaged. The Interior Department was in charge of J. D. Cox, of Ohio — an intelligent and practical man, who improved the service of his department, and had no personal difficulties with the President. But it became his duty to deal with a scheme of very bad repute known as the McGarrahan claim. His condemnation of it gave special offense to some congressional friends of the President, while his whole method of management had been odious to the brokers in public places; and a pressure was brought to bear upon the President, which resulted in Mr. Cox's retirement. This act was the sharpest discouragement which the President had yet given to the reform element in the party.

"How long," said the *Republican*, November 12, 1870,—"how long does he suppose the people will patiently endure this dealing with high office as if it were a presidential perquisite, to be given away upon his mere whim, without regard to the claims of the country? It was bad enough when he only dealt so with consulates and small post-offices; but now that he has come to foreign ministers and cabinet officers, it is intolerable. . . . He has simply allowed himself to manage public affairs, as if he were our master and not our steward. The American people have the same right to a cabinet officer that the American President has; he ought not to dismiss a secretary as he would a coachman, because he does not drive to suit this senator or that politician."

The congressional elections of 1870 had reduced by about one-half the Republican majority of one hundred in

the preceding House. In the Senate the Republicans were as four to one. From the lately rebel states they had a majority of the representatives and all but three or four of the senators. When Congress met for the session of 1871–72 it was plain that the subject nearest the President's heart was not the pacification of the South, nor administrative reform, but the annexation of San Domingo. Congress could not be coaxed or spurred into favoring it. To please the President the appointment of a commission to visit the island was voted; three eminent civilians were sent on a tour of investigation, and returned ultimately with a roseate report of the desirability of the acquisition. But the country did not care for San Domingo; did not want its mongrel addition to our citizenship; would not have it at any price. The importance of the matter lay in its disclosure of the President's views and temper, and in its indirect consequences. The opposition which it had bred between the President and Mr. Sumner had become chronic and bitter. Sumner was chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,—a place of special importance while the negotiations as to the English troubles were drawing to a culmination. The President's senatorial friends removed him from this position, solely on the ground of his unfriendly personal relations with the President and Secretary Fish. Such senators as Schurz, Trumbull, Wilson, Sherman, and the Morrills, opposed the deposition. But the strict Administrationists,— Carpenter, Chandler, Conkling, Edmunds, Morton, Howe, and others,—with the carpet-bag senators who closely followed their lead, carried the removal and appointed Simon Cameron in Sumner's place. Against Sumner's qualifications at such a time, a good deal might have been urged,—his deficiency in tact and conciliation, and his tendency to lofty and impracticable notions, such as inviting Great Britain

to withdraw her flag from this continent as the remedy for international difficulties. But the real motive of the removal was shown past all question, when to this place of highest dignity and importance there was appointed a man whose long public record was a story only of intrigue and suspected corruption, and whose sole recommendation lay in being a servile partisan of the President. In some degree this was a turning-point in the Administration's history. Thereafter there was in the Senate a Republican opposition,— unorganized, small in numbers, but weighty in character. It included Mr. Trumbull, eminent as an independent and conservative statesman; Mr. Sumner, the most conspicuous man among the anti-slavery old guard in Congress; and a senator from Missouri, of whom Charles Francis Adams said about this time: "The one man who seems to understand our institutions, their spirit, their history, their dangers, and their possibilities, better than any other citizen, is of foreign birth, and his name is Carl Schurz."

The worst political influences centered in the group of Administration senators, with the support which they received from the White House. The agents of the Administration were busy meddlers in the local disputes of the Republican party. In the South the quarrels of parties ran often to extreme bitterness and mischief; and the intriguers who had Washington influence behind them sometimes called to their assistance the United States troops, who were never resisted. The most scandalous instance of such interference was in New Orleans, when Mr. Casey — Collector of the Port and the President's brother-in-law — caused the Republican convention to be held in the Custom-house under guard of Federal soldiers, and the delegates opposed to him were excluded by the blue-coated sentinels. These infractions of constitutional order were alarming to intelligent observers

at the North, but a large part of the Northern people still held the belief that the rebellious and resentful South needed a sharp bridle. In Northern communities the active manipulation of caucuses and conventions by Federal officials, as for example in New York, where the President supported the Conkling against the Fenton faction, made no great impression on the general public, except when they involved fraud or gross neglect in the public business. When the management of the New York Custom-house became scandalously bad, because Collector Murphy was a pot-house politician, the great business community was touched in its purse, and grumbled more and more, till the President was driven to a reluctant dismissal of Mr. Conkling's camp-follower. But so long as the people did not suffer in pocket or in comfort, so long as business was good and public credit rising, and there was no glaring corruption or disorder, most men were disposed to look with indifference at what seemed the trivial faults of the Administration. Trivial they might not unnaturally appear to a generation lately emerged from a gigantic civil war and the overthrow of slavery.

But those who looked below the surface saw that the political drift was to some extent in the wrong direction. The nation was entering upon a new epoch, which its rulers gave small signs of comprehending. The people tended to absorption in their private affairs, leaving government to the professional politicians; the politicians conducted the government as a great business of place-giving; and when election day came round the people were roused by appeals to old passions to intrust affairs once more to the "grand old party." Intelligent reformers came to see that they must attack first the partisan civil service, which was the wage-fund of the place-hunting politicians; they therefore made civil-

service reform a leading object. The perversion or neglect of state-craft was responsible for the continuance of two conspicuous mischiefs,— Southern misgovernment, and an excessive and burdensome tariff. Accordingly one section of reformers gave prominence to amnesty and constitutional government at the South, while another section was urgent for revenue reform. Supporting and intensifying all other evils was the excess of party spirit, and the adroit use of passions born in a past epoch for the support of a few managers and manipulators,— so that a constant necessity of the reform movement was to cultivate independence of partisan bonds.

Conspicuous in that whole movement were a few leading journals. The prime need of the time was political education, and to give such education is the journalist's highest function. In an epoch of transition, the congressional or legislative leader is hampered by the close dependence of his own fortunes on the political organization with which he is connected. The newspaper is not free from some similar dependence upon its constituents, but from its other function as a news-giver it derives a hold upon popular support which makes safe a far larger liberty than can easily be practiced by the man who holds or seeks office. At this time the general practice among newspapers was one of considerable partisanship. But there was a growing element of independent journalism. There were a number of prominent journals which had not only the disposition to be fair, but the sagacity and foresight to discern the new issues. Conspicuous among them were the New York *Nation*, the New York *Evening Post*, the Chicago *Tribune*, the Cincinnati *Commercial*, and the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, conducted respectively by Mr. Godkin, Mr. Bryant, Horace White, Murat Halstead, and Henry Watterson. All of these were Republican in their general sympathies except the *Courier-Journal*. That

paper was doing a notable work in urging the Democracy, especially at the South, to break away from the questions of the past, accept heartily the new conditions of American nationality, and fall into line with progressive and reformatory ideas. The *Republican* said of the *Courier-Journal* in 1876 that it had been "the one best individual element in the work of restoration and reconstruction" at the South. It had been raised to eminence in the old Whig days by George D. Prentice; had risked its business prospects by its hostility to secession, and had been prominent among the forces that kept Kentucky from joining the Southern Confederacy. Of its editorial and business managers, the *Republican* said: "Mr. Watterson has a rare union of the great elements of genius, imagination, insight, philosophy, and practical common sense, while Mr. Haldeman is one of the half-dozen able newspaper managers in the country." The *Courier-Journal*, like the *Republican*, was notable from the fact that it had gained a national reputation and power without the support of a large local advertising field.

The *Republican* during this period fully maintained its character of an impartial and educational newspaper. Some of its sharpest strictures on the Administration have been quoted, but it was not an opposition paper until the last year of Grant's term. After fifteen months of his presidency it declared it to be, with all its defects, an acceptable Administration to the average citizen, and with good reason. As greater faults appeared it grew more sharply critical. At the close of 1871 it opposed Grant's renomination, but did not advocate a secession from the Republican party. In this year the Democratic state conventions had very generally taken the "New Departure," of which Vallandigham was the apostle in Ohio, Watterson in Kentucky, and John Quincy Adams in Massachusetts,—consisting in an explicit acceptance

of the three great Amendments, and a closing of all the issues which they represented. The *Republican* rejoiced in this advance, but it was not won to much confidence in the Democratic party. After the state convention in Springfield it said, September 15, 1871:

"The Democrats of Massachusetts, like those of the country at large, are steadily throwing away a great opportunity, and are condemning themselves to hopeless defeat, as long as they do nothing but find fault with the Republican party, and the natural course of things, and refuse to take up and heartily carry forward some real measure of reform. At present they are just running for luck, and seeking to profit by the feuds among the Republicans to regain the loaves and fishes of office."

In the previous year the Chicago *Tribune* had proposed the formation of a new party, on such principles as civil-service reform, revenue reform, and the resumption of specie payments. The *Republican*, approving of these ends, yet held that they should be sought "within rather than without" the Republican party. It had said, November 25, 1870:

"Threats of a new party are natural enough to the more earnest and impatient, and even may be useful in the progress of the campaign for reform; but so long as the Republican party has the vitality and the flexibility that it has heretofore exhibited, so long especially as the Democratic party preserves that Bourbon stubbornness which threw away its opportunities in 1868, and threatens to repeat the folly in 1872,— so long at least must doctrinaires and reformers look to the Republican party as the instrumentality of progress and the means for reforming even its own abuses."

In 1871, the "Bourbon stubbornness" of the Democracy had yielded somewhat, but the *Republican* held that it was not yet entitled to much confidence. In that year

the party in New York allowed the representatives of Tweed-governed Tammany to take their places in the state convention, against the strong protests of Tilden, O'Conor, and Ottendorfer; the Democrats had to be beaten in the election of that autumn before the Ring could be overthrown and the better chiefs of the Democracy enabled to put Tammany itself for a time into clean hands.

In regard to the habitual tone of the *Republican* toward the party which it still supported, the paper said, May 5, 1871:

"Very likely it is true, as a critical contemporary suggests, that the *Republican* is more apt to find fault with the Republican party than with the Democratic. The just parent is much more prone to discipline his own children than he is his neighbor's,—especially if there be reason for secret satisfaction in the improprieties of the latter. We confess to much more interest in the character and good conduct of the Republican party than in that of the Democratic. The Republican party is still worth saving, but it is almost hopeless and certainly discouraging work, reforming the Democrats. Our great anxiety is lest they should be so bad that they cannot longer be effectively used as a moral scarecrow to the Republicans."

The *Republican's* treatment of public questions grew more and more to lie wholly outside of their reference to party organization. In 1871, while Massachusetts had repulsed its chief demagogue from the governorship, New York had been roused to overcome the worst set of plunderers that ever fattened on a modern city. It was a temporary effort, from which the city soon relapsed, not to so low a depth, but to a chronic condition of bad government. The situation furnished to the *Republican* the occasion for one of its most vigorous appeals.

"We have a spasm of public spirit, and while it lasts we perform wonders. But it does not last long. The unaccustomed exertion brings on the inevitable reaction. We say to our souls: 'We have done this or that; we have ousted these rogues and put these honest men in their places; we have discharged our duties; now let us rest and take our ease.' And we rest and take our ease accordingly. We go off to our farms and our merchandise. We again find it too much trouble to go to the caucus and the polls; in a word, we drop off into political sleep. And meanwhile the ship drifts,—and drifts. We ought to know by this time — we have had a sufficiently costly experience to teach us — that what good men will not do for the love of their country, bad men will do for the love of themselves, whether it be to run caucuses, or manage elections, or hold office. This whole caucus system, from the ward meeting up to the national convention, has been converted into a machine to relieve the people of the task of governing themselves. What is the result? That the whole framework of our government from top to bottom is being eaten out and worn away by a dry-rot; that we have almost come to look upon self-seeking and place-hunting and thieving the public money as matters of course, disagreeable, to be sure, but inevitable; that in this free democratic country, politician has become a term of reproach. How long can we go on in this way? The Tammany ring has been overthrown, has it? That is certainly a thing to thank God for. But the Tammany ring was nothing but an ulcer on the body of the state. The disease is in the blood. . . . If this affair at New York is a Sedan, the thing for us to do now is to move on Paris. We must push things. Press and pulpit and platform must take on a higher usefulness than they have had hitherto. Party must be shoved for some time to come into the background. Every honest, God-fearing man must make the performance of even trivial public duties a question of conscience. A higher, more searching test must be applied to public acts and public men. Public opinion must be straightened out and put in shape to discharge rightly and effectively its tremendous function. An incessant war must be kept up on abuses, wherever found. All hands must fall to work to

clean out and disinfect the national premises. It will be a long and tedious job. In fact there will be literally no end to it; — since after we have once got the establishment into a good and wholesome working condition, we shall have the task of keeping it so. But unless we can bring ourselves to undertake the drudgery — if we choose to speak and think of it by this name — of taking care of our institutions, we cannot hope to keep them. More than that, we shall not deserve to keep them."

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Family Life.—Letters: 1869–1871.

WHEN Mr. Bowles returned from his daily work at the *Republican* office to his home, it was as a tired and worn-out man. He came into a house whose mistress made it the great object of her life, and the first law of the household, that he should have quiet and rest. His great difficulty was to get sleep. "I am hungry for sleep," he used sometimes to say. He would toss and tumble for hours after going to bed, sometimes till daylight; well for him if he got four or five hours of tolerable sleep. In the morning all were kept quiet, that he might not be wakened, and so it came about that a kind of hush pervaded the house at all times. It became a second nature to all the children to make father's rest and comfort their first thought. "The quiet of my home has lengthened my life," he said. He liked to receive good care and petting, and he had it to his heart's content. Nor was he spoiled by it. He always carried himself among his family with self-control and sweetness. When he entered his own door, the mental strain relaxed, the tired look showed itself in his face, his voice became low, sometimes nearly inaudible. He was almost silent, until dinner and a cup of tea had brightened him somewhat, or unless, as often happened, a guest was present, for whose sake he kept himself aroused.

There were now seven children in the family; the four younger — Charles, Dwight, Ruth, and Bessie — born between 1861 and 1868. The children filled a very large place in the father's life. He made a study of each child's nature, and not only loved them all as being his own, but gave full recognition to the individuality of each. To all his friends it was one great charm of his friendship that he drew out from each the characteristic and best trait, and appreciated it. He gave to his children the same kind of distinctive personal recognition. It might be said of him, as it was said of a mother of a numerous family, "He had in his heart a separate cell of honey for each child." His children all returned his affection with a warm love and loyalty. No one of them went wrong or was perverse. He entered sympathetically into their lives, made their friends his friends; saw through their eyes, yet exercised his larger wisdom in planning for them. To amply provide for them was the strongest of the personal motives that held him to his work. As he remembered the arduous labor in early years which had been for him the price of success, he was determined that his children should be spared the necessity of any such struggle. One of his aims was to gradually transfer to each one, beginning when they came of age, the property which he intended to leave them, that they might accustom themselves while still under his eye to the right use of it. He began this with some of the older children, but the hard times which began in 1873 obliged him to give up the plan.

It was a favorite idea with him to train his children in bearing responsibility. The eldest daughter was early taught to take a part in the household administration, and give a needed relief to her mother; and the second daughter had for a considerable time the oversight of the

outdoor establishment, including the direction of the workers, the getting of supplies for the barn, and the like. Such arrangements, however, brought little diminution of the father's cares, for his rooted habit was to keep a close superintendence of whatever work he intrusted to others.

The shadow on the household was the ill health of both parents. Mrs. Bowles suffered frequently and severely from asthma. Life becomes hard work even for the bravest and most unselfish when it is reduced to a struggle for breath. In a large family, ill health in the older members acts in a degree as a preventive of hearty and buoyant cheer among the children, but it gives a good training in mutual consideration and helpfulness. This family, too, was rich in resources of enjoyment. The father loved to share with the others the best things that came into his own full life, including his friendships and his correspondence. There was one place on the mantel-piece where he always put such of his letters as contained good things for the family reading. As soon as the worst of his fatigue was over, he liked to have close about him the pleasant stir of family life, even when he was at work. Frequently when he was writing in his library he would keep open the doors into the adjoining room, so as to catch the talk and laughter of the young folks. "I was at the house one night," said a friend, "and sat talking with Mrs. Bowles, with the doors open into the next room, where he sat within full hearing of us, dictating to his secretary an article on the Credit Mobilier. He hadn't a book or paper to refer to, but there he sat, stroking his beard, giving facts, figures, everything out of his head — till I was scared! Next morning, there it was, an editorial in two columns — all that one of the big city papers would have spread over a

page; yes, all and more too, for it was put in such shape that you understood and remembered it." A lady writes:

"While visiting at the home of Mr. Bowles, I observed that in the afternoons, seated upon his piazza with other members of the family, he had usually in his hands a copy of the *Republican*. This he folded in squares, not more than the width of a column or two, and held close to his eyes, scanning it intently,— now and then, without raising his eyes, exclaiming, 'Come, talk, talk; have you nothing to say to me?' 'But you are wading through that sea of words.' 'You will not interrupt. I do this automatically. It is my knitting-work, to run thus through the weekly and semi-weekly papers. It is not necessary, but I feel better to do it. Now, talk!'"

Driving was a favorite recreation of the family. Sometimes in summer the ride was taken before breakfast, Mr. Bowles on horseback and some of the others in a carriage. More often he drove with his wife later in the day. They explored together the countless pleasant country roads which surround Springfield. It was his wife who originally developed in him the love of nature. Sometimes she was his companion in his longer journeys, but oftener she was kept at home, either by want of health, or following the habit and passion of her life — to give pleasure to her husband and children rather than herself. For several summers the family made a home in Blandford, lying high on the hills twenty miles west of Springfield, for the sake of the almost mountain air. Here at one time they took a house and entertained many guests.

At the Springfield home the invited guests were very frequent. Mr. Bowles wanted to make his house a meeting-place for interesting and distinguished strangers and his fellow-townsmen. He entertained a great many delightful and eminent people. The effort to bring about any free and general meeting between these and his local

acquaintances was often a difficult one, because at any such gathering he found few to share with him the labor of entertainment; his own powers as a host were such that he was often left to do the whole. The most successful and memorable occasions were those when a few choice spirits, men and women, met under his roof for a day or two. At such times there was a free unforced flow of talk on all subjects under the heavens, the sparkle of wit, and the warmth of a sympathy and cordiality finer than wit. Each person was put at his best, and the central inspiration of the good-fellowship was the host. These, indeed, were "nights and suppers of the gods."

The letters which here follow, of 1869–71, are for the most part illustrative of Mr. Bowles's personal and private life. The first two, to Mr. Dawes, relate to the contest between him and Mr. Blaine for the speakership of the House.

To H. L. Dawes.

February 8, 1869.

. . . My opinion is that Grant's cabinet and the way it is made up will prove a bomb-shell in especial congressional and political circles. Out of the disorder and confusion, you may come out at the top, and you may go clear under. But Grant will win ultimately, and his friends will be triumphant. There will be a resurrection, if you are slaughtered by Butler & Co. to make an anti-Grant "ring." Depend upon that. But I have faith yet. You ought to be Speaker, and I believe you will be. If you are not, I want a sober, serious talk with you as to your future. You must take a more bold and independent position in the House, and lead against corruption of all sorts. You must be a wise and discriminating Washburne.* And to be that is to be the greatest man in the country for the next two and four years. You can be it, and you should, if this thing fails. But this won't fail.

* E. B. Washburne, of Illinois, who had been in Congress a champion of economy and opponent of all doubtful schemes.

I sha'n't go to Washington. I am too busy at home, with book-making, etc. Our business affairs are not in good shape, and need my close attention.

ST. JAMES HOTEL, BOSTON, March 7, 1869.

It was only for a day that I was afraid you had made a mistake in withdrawing. You could have done nothing else; and the whole affair seems almost to have given you a recognition, an appreciation and opportunity, worth more than the speakership, certainly more than the speakership won at any cost of yourself. I congratulate you upon it all.

I found I could not do my book and magazine work at home, and so have come down here to Boston to change the scene and be more retired. Then the lobby investigation required my attention. But I am keeping very shy, and have seen but few people. Gooch says Claflin is thinking of offering you Judge Hoar's place. It would be a nice thing to have happen, whether you accepted it or not. I shall see Claflin now myself, for I should amazingly like you to have that recognition. And if it should come, and the change would suit you,— don't doubt that you can fill the place well. I know you can. But I don't quite like to have you leave Congress. It seems to me the door is wide for a new and fine career there, and anything you want as its result.

I hope you will say a word to Grant and Washburne for Dr. Howe for Greece. All our active earnest men want him put ahead of Motley for foreign place. Sumner would probably say Motley first and Howe second. Go for Howe, for yourself and for me!

I like the cabinet — you ought to like it, because it is a revolution, because it breaks up rings, and makes reform more easy and possible.

To his Wife.

BOSTON, March, 1869.

I cannot think of seeking, or allowing my friends to seek for me, or even of accepting, a foreign appointment. If affairs at the office were so that I could leave them for, say two years, with safety to my interests, I should like to get off for about

that time, take the whole family, and get thorough rest and change for you and me, and new means of education for the children. It is desirable for us all, but it is impossible. I can't afford it.

In the summer of this year he accomplished a cherished purpose — to take his wife with him in another Western journey. They traveled with a party of friends, including Mr. and Mrs. Colfax, and visited Colorado, California, and Oregon. For once he spared himself from writing, so but a few glimpses are given of the journey.

To his oldest Daughter.

Fall River, Colorado, July 27, 1869.

Back from Georgetown to-night; Monday we ascended the range, not Grey's Peak, but near by; saw all the grand panorama of snow-mountains; equal to what you and I saw from Lincoln; had snow-storm on top; sunshine, rain, thunder, and lightning; saw flowers "to kill"—more and finer than we saw last year; had a grand, white day, equal to the best and most distinctive of ours last year; started out at 9 A. M., back at 8 P. M.; 7 miles in wagon, 3 in saddle, and back the same; Mother stood it all bravely, and was in glory most of the time; she is really a great deal better, and enjoying everything more and more.

To C. W. Bryan.

San Francisco, August 17, 1869.

1. It is most grateful to hear of your good health. Pray treasure it. Take care daily.

2. Mrs. Bowles is greatly better. She has come on and up grandly, and is really better than I.

3. I am gaining, but my maladies are too deep-seated and long-borne to be easily uprooted. I shall be better, but never well.

4. We are constantly occupied. It is one continual whirl and round of going, seeing, talking. A great deal of time is wasted

in formal calls — it is a dreadful bore. Then, traveling with women sops up one's time awfully.

5. It is out of the question, writing for the paper. I cannot even read the copies I get. But I am getting strength and gaining knowledge of men and things that I can turn to good account hereafter.

6. So far as I see I like the course of the paper in my absence. Sanborn and Pomeroy seem to be doing well, though naturally it is less positive and aggressive than when I am at home.

7. Don't bother about "Our New West." . . . It is hardly heard of west of the Missouri River. There could be great numbers of it sold in all this interior region if they knew how to do it.

8. Send a copy of "Across the Continent," "Switzerland," and "Pacific R. R.," to Gen. G. W. Frost, Union Pacific R. R., Omaha, Nebraska, with my compliments, and ask him, at my suggestion, to give you the name of the book house there which has the control of the car sales on that road, and to speak to them in behalf of these books, as he said he would. He volunteered the matter, and said they ought to be put on the cars and would sell immensely. Then, on getting hold of the house, do what you can with them. This is our best chance.

9. I do not now expect to get home before October 12–15.

10. Charley Sumner, who is one of the editors of the San Francisco *Herald*, asks lovingly for you.

11. Cordially remember us to all in and about the office. Lovingly recall us to Mrs. Bryan, as to your own heart.

September 1.

. . . Mrs. Bowles enjoys everything to the full, and is drinking in new life. It will be a turning-point in her life. I am also improving, and shall bring back new strength and I hope a good winter's work in my bones. It is well I cannot write now for the paper. It is better for me, for you all, too, that I put some passages of silence into my life on these themes. Everybody is writing now. My record is made up. I could do nothing now that would appear well in comparison. But I am not idle in mind. I am taking in knowledge that will be of avail.

To his Daughter.

Yo-Semite Valley, August 25, 1869.

We have been here two days; stay here one more; go out Thursday; reach San Francisco Saturday night. Mother is up to fever heat with enjoyment; gets dreadfully tired; is very nervous over bad roads, rocks, dust, etc.; but insists on seeing everything, doing everything, and is undergoing an amount of horseback riding, rock-climbing, and fatigue and hard work generally, quite fearful to contemplate. It would amaze all Springfield to see her and what she is doing. She wants to stay as long as we can; to go to Oregon and everything; and has got over homesickness entirely. I have been trying to break up the Oregon expedition; but everybody is against me, and nobody more so than Mother. She says she never expects to come again, and wants to see all she can. So, unless you summon us, you need not expect us before October 15. Then sure,— I *won't* stay away longer. Mother sends love; mine to you and all.

Portland, Oregon, September 7, 1869.

. . . We have hospitable and hearty greeting here — there is a personality about it that is very pleasant and touching; partly because we are the old friends of four years ago, partly because Oregon has not been overburdened with guests this season as California has, and partly because Mr. Colfax is especially and politically popular here. In fact, just now, "everything is lovely and the goose 'yangs high"— not hangs high, but "'yangs," which is negro for flies. This is a notable correction of a Bross classic.

You should provide warm clothing and plenty of wraps for the sea voyage. It will be very cold. I should say a flannel undersuit for bed, loose and warm, for there you will spend at least three or four of the first days. Do not get tired or worn down before starting for Europe. Take every pains to be fresh, strong, and poised. That is the point where sea-sickness is victor or vanquished. Remember this.

We send love to all in the dear home. Let each one feel he or she has our individual thought and affection. Our absence only endears all to us — makes our thought more tender.

The voyage to which the last letter alludes took his daughter and Miss Whitney abroad together for a year of residence and study in Germany,—a year which was extended to two. His eldest son soon followed and joined them.

To Miss Whitney.

SPRINGFIELD, November 10, 1869.

Sallie's letters cut off a wide variety of themes to write about — the state of the weather, nearly always possible to me after Colorado and California; Mary's asthma; the progress of the teeth among the children; the latest smart thing of the baby; the servant-gal question, more important even than the origin of evil,— being its chief illustration,— than immortality indeed, for it makes one indifferent to all phases of the future; the newest engagements, the freshest deaths, the saddest births; the sweetest of neighborhood gossip,— for all of these I am now cut off, and refer you, not exactly, as the placards say, to the "small bills," but to Sallie. I am afraid, with these limitations, my letters to you must be barren indeed. You and I have settled all the great questions, or kindly agreed to let somebody else do it; I am rampant neither on science nor poetry; the Lord has not recently made me his vicegerent, and I modestly prefer he should be his own interpreter; if he has anything to say to you, I presume he can find a tongue of his own, and prefers to use it directly,— *I* should! So don't scold me if my correspondence should be dull; fall back on the eternities, and believe in me as your scientific soul does in the old red sandstone of the Connecticut valley.

. . . It is "real mean," anyhow, for you and Sallie to go off together. What do you both suppose will become of my physical well-being, and my spiritual nature, with the sweet ministers to each the other side of the world? How can you expect me to be sound in body and mind — graceful of mien or sweet of heart — under such circumstances? In good truth, my dear friend, I have been very ill at ease with the world and myself these last two weeks. I find myself really in no better health for these long three months of absence and travel. There

is an accession of flesh and a temporary improvement in physical strength; but my stomach and my head are both as weak and unreliable as ever, and my nerves as edgy and uncontrollable. I do not know as I expected anything better, and yet I have suffered the agony of a real disappointment and the bitterness of a real despair. There is so much for me to do; there is so much that I want to do; there is so much that I *could* do, with a reasonable degree of nervous power; but it has all got to go undone. I hate to give up — to give up, indeed, is death indeed; and yet to keep up the old struggle is constant torture to myself, and very great suffering, as I sadly know, for all my friends. Don't think I have been doing much work since I came back, — I have really done very little, — I tried, but found I could not, — that so far as that was concerned I was really no better than when I left off in the spring. You and Sallie mustn't worry about this, but it is right you should know it. But you can't help it now except by being patient and indulgent with me, and helping me to be patient and indulgent with myself.

. . . I don't find any of these women who speak that take in or at least give out the whole question [woman's rights]; — they offer its croppings, its teeth, its incidents, but not itself. Oh for a woman to take it all in round and full, and then give it out with breadth and feeling, and yet with philosophy and logic, — it does seem to me that so the world would understand and admit and embrace, as it does not know or dream or see now. I want so much to write a few papers on the subject myself; but strength or rather feebleness forbids. Should I, doubtless the vanity that burns in me on the subject — that it has not yet been adequately presented — would ooze out in a feeble accomplishment, and I should hide my head in shame.* It is so much easier to dream than to do, to criticise than to create! I hardly ever, though, had the grand passion for work, for doing something better and bigger than I have had the fortune yet to do, more than in these last weeks; when, *au*

* The desire here expressed to write a series of papers on the new position of woman took effect three months later in a single article, — February 14, 1870, — headed "The Question Re-stated" — which in freshness of treatment and breadth of view is one of the best of Mr. Bowles's writings. It is quoted in Chapter XLIX.

contraire, I have had to taste, more deeply than ever, the truth that my work was done, that I could only henceforth stay and suffer and scold and criticise and jostle my little empty pint-pot of life *à la* Chinese.

Tell me honestly how you are,— how you get on in your new life,— its pleasures and its pains,— how deep you are likely to get into metaphysics,— how far away from your ignorant friend.

To his Daughter.

November 24, 1869.

What a good time you did have in England! I never shall die contented till I have had a summer's run on foot and in a dog-cart over that country. It seems to me one of the best things to do — after Colorado! . . . I am myself much better these last few days, and had a very successful gentlemen's dinner-party on Monday — Charles Francis Adams, Jr., Walker, King, Leonard, and George Bliss, Jr. Railroads were the theme, and they talked me down to the last ounce of nerves. Mother is pretty well this week, but the weather is bad, and she can put no dependence on herself. And yet, if I could persuade her to "give up to it"— throw away dull care — keep her rooms mornings and evenings — go out only in the middle of the day, and live virtuously on bread and meat and "a few vegetables," as the old man dying said to the parson who said we could "not live by bread alone,"— then I do believe she could pass a very comfortable winter. Her strength is renewed so much that in this way, I believe, she could float on successfully. But I am so afraid she will wear herself out by trying to do all her powers will let her every day — and a little more. Mamie gets on splendidly; she and I and the girls, who are as good as ever, could run the machine with great ease,— and do,— so far as Mother will stand out of the way and see the glory of God as a spectator, not as a participant.

I ran up to Amherst Friday afternoon via Northampton and back Saturday morning, making a pleasant little visit with the Dickinsons. . . . I believe ——— is coming up to spend a few days with us next week; but somehow, now you are gone, I dread more than ever to have strangers come into the house.

And yet, I know it is better for us all that we should have them come.

In short, Sallie, we miss you. You would feel bad if we didn't. Don't worry because we do. Really, we get on quite as well as could be expected. I am glad you are off; make the best of it all in knowledge and happiness; and think ever sweetly of your loving father.

December 1, 1869.

. . . I went to New Haven Friday — to New York on Saturday, and home Monday. At New York, went to Press Club dinner Saturday night; 150 people, men and women, only very few I knew; saw Mrs. Parton (Fanny Fern) for the first time — a coarse-featured, strong face, with Fanny-Fern-ish manners; while Parton is little, delicate, pale, and almost feminine in appearance. Sunday, to hear Mr. Frothingham — walked home with John Bigelow, and called; had Anna Dickinson and Whitelaw Reid of *Tribune* to lunch, and discussed woman questions for two hours; jealousies, rivalries, and factions have already entered into the new movement; dined at Barker's; went from nine to ten to the Carys' Sunday-night reception, meeting more or less saints and sinners; Monday, looked over steamships, called at newspaper offices, and brought home S——, whom I met at the Carys'.

December 14, 1869.

You are getting more than a fair share of ten-cent postage stamps, but I don't like to have this steamer go without putting in an appearance for myself. It was greatly re-assuring to hear how nicely you are settled at Cassel — how successful your journey had been — and how cheerily you had taken up your new life. I pray all may go as begun. So shall I feel repaid — in part — for my losses; not wholly, for I don't feel as if life could ever fully compensate me for being without you so long, now when I want you so much. That's selfish, of course; but there is a comfort in being selfish sometimes. At any rate, I am not ashamed of it in your case.

. . . Mother, I am glad to say, is a good deal better this week than she has been since you went away; she is having

dress-makers "to kill," and is busy with Christmas, having a plan for a tree for our family, the Kings, etc., at our house Christmas eve. I am afraid she will break down and be sick before the time comes; but I think she is nearer the great lesson of her life — that she must withhold and be an invalid, and so be tolerably well — than ever before. . . Things move on pleasantly in the domestic department. James is very satisfactory in his work, and it is a relief to the girls to have no man in the house. I had a pleasant night and morning, after Sam went away [to join the party in Germany], with Captain Bradbury, at his house, on the very edge of the Palisades, about ten miles up. It is a beautiful location, and the region is only just coming into fashionable and respectable occupancy. I am doing rather more work than usual just now; all I can, perhaps more than I ought to; but it is such joy to me to work that it is very difficult to resist the outward call and the inward temptation. I get to the office about 10 A. M., loaf and lunch for half an hour or so at noon, and go away at 4 — dining at 5:30, with the family supper — and spending the evenings in light reading and a half-comatose existence. The early spring you must look forward to, to compensate for rough and dreary winter. Do not write too much. Let us hear from you or Sam once a week, and do not undertake to do justice to us all. I can be patient with few words and occasional. I shall be irregular in writing, and won't try again until I am fresher than I am this afternoon. But thought of you all is inspiration and hope and desire. I greet all my dear, dear Germans most lovingly. Be happy and loving together. Then I shall be more than content.

December 29, 1869.

My dear Children: Sallie, inspired by her maternal experiences of the last year or two, writes occasionally to her "dear family at home." I do not know but I shall take up addressing "my dear family in Germany." A pretty good part of my heart, of my hope, and my life, are certainly bound up with you in that little strange German town of yours. Do not doubt we think of you constantly, and pray for you heartily. No joy is ours that we do not offer you, and share; no pain presses that

we do not selfishly and instinctively seek you to relieve it. We are happy in your comfort and in your enjoyment; we sorrow that anything is denied to you of agreeable experiences and of joyful ministrations; we would put warm pillows under cold feet, help digestion of hearty German food, and soothe every tired nerve with the loving music of home. But we don't play on a harp of a thousand strings, neither the jew's-harp; and I presume, all in all, life is as agreeable to you there as here. It is not always pleasure to think so, but it is enough to keep me reasonably reconciled to your absence. You wouldn't like to have us thoroughly content that you are there, not here. And the lesson we bring home is — dreadful, though, isn't it? — that we must be so agreeable and so fascinating, that neither modern languages, nor geese stuffed with apples and raisins, nor handsome young men who address you in "good but hesitating English," can ever induce you to wander more from the home of those who love you — and find fault with you!

I don't suppose there is an item of news that Mother has not written you. So I must confine myself to myself, and yet that subject is twice told in more than a single sense, and is just now very barren indeed. Miss Whitmarsh's little visit was very pleasant; and I am enjoying the Calhoun-Runkle visit that ends to-night. We have had no company for them; partly because of the bad weather, and partly because I am too weary when night comes to have anybody setting their suction-pumps into my dry wells,— or wanting to, or thinking even they might. Mrs. Runkle is likely to continue an editorial writer for the *Tribune*. They think a great deal of her, and perhaps I have said that she seems to me the one best woman journalist in America. But then it needs a good deal of steam to keep her in motion. Her nerves lie near the surface. That is the price we Americans pay for our advanced life — our leadership in thought actualized and illustrated.

Christmas was only tolerable. Mother was quite sick, broke down the night before, and was only able to sit up in the evening. But the children enjoyed everything, and are now going through bilious experiences by way of settlement. Mother's attacks are more and more of a sick headache character. But

she is really a great deal better, and a great deal happier, than for several years. Her dip into life the last summer has given her a new interest in people and things, and reconciled her greatly to the infirmities of folks.

Except our outside visitors, we are living very quietly within ourselves. I sleep irregularly and indifferently, and am rarely unconscious of a head. When company comes I am put upstairs, and sleep or dream among the things sacred to Sallie's or Cousin Maria's memory.

. . . I think of you both as together for over Christmas, and as settling down into loving work and play, making up, with your "guide, philosopher, and friend," a charming and most creditable branch of my family — to whom all tender thought and loving consideration.

To Mrs. L. G. Calhoun.

December 14, 1869.

We were disappointed, of course, not to greet you; but I did not wonder, with your much work and many trials, that you were unable to come. But do, if possible, come and see us, before you launch away into the eternity of marriage. You certainly need a *bit* of some kind to restrain you; but after the excellent advice I gave you at Chicago, I am ashamed of you for wearing yourself out so soon. It isn't kind even to one's friends to make such a spendthrift of one's self. And yet, alas, it is so easy to preach and so hard to practice!

. . . Halstead of the *Commercial* is on our side, as you will see by this and other articles of his. I gave him a letter to you some weeks ago, and want you to see him some time. He is a generous-natured Western man, with high journalistic power, and, altogether, a character in newspaper circles.

I look with awe and reverence on the man *who dares*, and with envy on the man *who can;* while I am most cordially yours.

Mary joins me in most affectionate remembrances. She is quite well this week, and nothing would delight her heart more than to welcome you to our home — even if but for a day.

December 20, 1869.

As a woman and a sister, I am ashamed of you! Think of the blow you have given to the whole "movement" in exhibiting your inability to take care of yourself, and fleeing for refuge to a "weak tyrant man." Et tu, Brute! or Mrs. Brute, if you prefer.

Yes; be sure to come direct to our home when you come to town, double. Let us know the train, and then drive directly to us. We found out Brother Runkle was a "good fellow" long before you did, and now the pity that is akin to love is added to hearty appreciation!

Mary is sorry that you did not come before. A quiet week in our home would have certainly fitted you for the heaven of matrimony: now you go into it with all your sins full blossomed on your head. I assume the judicial robes — "and may the Lord have mercy on your soul!"

I find with pleasure that Mrs. R. has been talking with my friend Allen at Boston, and has got some good advice as well as comfort. But we will talk over all this when you come — as fail not now!

To Miss Whitney.

New York, February 11, 1870.

. . . It seems to me you are all having a very choice winter. I doubt if you can repeat it in all respects so satisfactorily another season. Sam says the loose plan is to spend the three months divided between Swiss and German travel; but do give the dear mountains the larger share. It seems to me you will settle down upon Berlin for next winter. All things considered, I believe it is the best place. Besides other advantages, it is the center of the empire,— the seat of politics,— the stronghold of Germany,— and politics now means so much — everything — that it is well to study these things at their fountain-head. Germany, as represented at Berlin, is to be more and more the great power of Central Europe. You have seen at Cassel the interior, domestic life and character of the German. You will find at Berlin its highest outward aggressive expression, development, organization, in science, literature,

politics, art, and all the other things that make for peace and progress in the history of the race and the world. Oh, dear! how I wish I had the opportunity for study now of books and peoples and governments. I know enough to feel most painfully my failings, my hunger. Comparing myself with other men, it is in the culture of books — the alphabet of things — that I feel most keenly my disparity. In instinct of truth, in seizure of the salient thought or kernel, in practical dealing with affairs, I feel a general equality, and am ready to measure myself and grapple with people around me,— but when I come to the great fields of experience and illustration that history and literature offer, I am so oppressed with my utter ignorance that I am more modest than is healthy for me! If I had an enduring head, I believe I would make up some of this deficiency even now; but the poverty there means that this other poverty is also irremediable. It looks as if I was almost doomed to loafing for the rest of my life. And if I were independent of time and incumbrance, I would put in now two or three years of just that sort of thing,—I would roam about the world, studying books some, nature a good deal, and people and institutions more.

To his Daughter.

BREVOORT HOUSE, N. Y., March 11, 1870.

I am having a "real good vacation"— rarely so pleasant and useful a one in the winter, and it has given me new hope and faith. I go home Monday morning, just three weeks after leaving; divided substantially into one week in New York and two in Washington. I have been very busy all through, without doing any work, save dining and breakfasting and talking; but my head has steadily improved, and though I have had a cold part of the time, and more or less of my chronic "cussedness," the general result is as above, and ought to warm the hearts of all who have to endure me in life. I feel pretty sure now, as I did not before leaving home, of being able to go through the spring without absolutely breaking down. I was treated very civilly in Washington, indeed, and without any forth-putting was able to see and talk with all, or nearly all, the people I wished to.

Washington is growing more and more agreeable, even attractive, as a winter residence; and I should like greatly to take you or Mother next winter down there, and stay for three or four months. I could earn my living by work for the *Republican* and perhaps other papers. Perhaps we will do it some season, if not the next. Cambridge, New Haven, New York, and Washington are on the whole the most attractive residences in America for cultivated people, interested in the great social, literary, and political subjects, which running into each other make up the science of modern life and government. There is a good deal of coarse gayety in Washington, as in New York; but there is also that which is more refined, and it is increasing. There is enough of all kinds for everybody to make a selection. "Each to his own." I am in the way, you know, of observing and more or less dipping into all kinds. There is nothing more odd to me than the *variety* of people I know who put faith in me and pay attention to me. That is the outgrowth of journalism, however. It must be eclectic and many-sided — however choice and elective one's personal nature may be.

. . . Your late letters give me much pleasure. Those written during my birthday week were very sweet and grateful to me. Your mother and I are both anxious you should stay another winter and spring in Europe; we mean to have you, if we can. We need you badly enough, and hunger for you deeply enough — no doubt of all that — but looking forward through the years, we count it the lesser selfishness to have you stay longer. . . . Much depends on how the next six months treat your mother and me; and what mother will be willing to have Mamie do. My idea is that M. should leave school, and follow your experience at home, so far as she can, till you return. I believe it will be well for her and useful for us. She will have no such good time for that sort of education. The moment you get home, then we must all subside. What willing serfs we shall be!

April 4, 1870.

You know I am always trying experiments with my work and play — this is my last: up at 8 or 9 — a cup of coffee; a ride of an hour; breakfast 10 to 11; office 12 to 4; an hour's walk

or ride; dinner at 5; rest, and tea at 7; office from 8 or 9 till 10 or 11; bed at 12. This arrangement is best for my business — it is very desirable that I should be at the office in the evening, if possible.

To Charles Allen.

April 29, 1870.

. . . I feel very sure somehow that we shall beat them [the Hartford and Erie]. There is nothing left to log-roll with; the disposition of the legislature is conservative; the Worcester *Spy's* active accession to our side is useful; and Brooks's pamphlet and Bird in the *Journal* are very effective. I don't believe the majority of the committee can agree on any proposition acceptable alike to the road and the legislature. But our part of the fight is substantially over; we shall keep up talk, of course,— we can't help that,— but our cause is to triumph by the later accessions, and these will be won by other influences than the *Republican*. I understand clearly our *rôle* and our part in this business; it has cost something in the past; doubtless it will cost more in the future; but I am glad to have fought it and willing to pay its penalties. Nor will you, I am sure, ever have any real occasion to regret that you have done your part so boldly and so effectively. It needed iconoclastic work — and it has got it. Bird, who fights with gloved hands! — ahem — now has his opportunity. Tell him to keep cool, and not blackguard anybody! I will be down next week if there is any call.

To Miss Whitney.

May 3, 1870.

. . . I am on the hunt for a new amanuensis. I can't do all I want to do, all I have to do, without one, without greatly overworking,— and I mean to have a good one at almost any price. I really am doing full, fair day's work on the paper, but it keeps me worn down and very nervous. Mr. Warren, one of my promising young men,— the best writer almost on the paper, though confined wholly to news now,— is going to graduate and go to Europe either this summer or next fall. I am sorry to lose him, but he is wise to go now. Perhaps I shall need him in a higher place when he comes back. If Sanborn should not

stay with us, I should greatly like to have Warren; though, of course, he is not up to near so much or so various work. Did you see my article on "Divorce Made Easy"?* I believe that is up to your conservative stand-point on that question. I am sure with you we can't afford to weaken those great institutions of our social life, marriage and the family. I am curious to see how the larger influence of woman in society and government is to affect these delicate matters of sexual relations and social organizations. I look for some modifications, of course; there are evils that must be modified, if not wholly eradicated, before we can feel at rest in the millennial pathway. I feel rather than see the way out; but it will come. I have such an optimistic faith,—and yet it is very hard to keep it fresh and strong, in the presence of such wickedness, of such suffering, of such topsy-turning of right and wrong, and the shall-bes and the might-have-beens, as we are just now witnessing.

May 27, 1870.

I don't believe you have had in Germany two such perfect days as we have had here this week. No matter if it is cold, cloudy, and windy to-day; those were days such as Italy cannot surpass — unless at moonlight under the Coliseum with a sentimental theologue — and even California cannot equal. Your California sunshine has a certain dry, hard flavor; these were clear and soft withal. I wonder if we shall have such weather in heaven! whether or no we go — whether or no such weather! But if the world lives much longer it will have abolished all these notions of its youth. The Unitarians came, and abolished hell; Parker came, Higginson stays, to abolish Christ; the next conceited set of upstarts, inventing a new elixir of life, out of gin and juniper berries, will probably supersede heaven, or bring it down to earth. But that is what the rest of us dream of doing — but it can't be done so long as nerves thrill and stomachs labor. No elixir of love, or gin, can make heaven, with neuralgia playing on the fiddles of the orchestra, and dyspepsia groaning through the grim trombone. Give it up. I think I will stick to the original heaven, as a thing more sure.

* Quoted in Chapter XLIX.

I welcome the tokens of your being somewhat better. Stick to it; mild as to coffee; delicate as to study; glutton as to outdoors — nothing so good as mere outdoors — that is my prescription. But what would you not give for a course of tenderloin beefsteaks — thick, juicy, and — large! There is courage and poetry and morality and piety in such! And Germany never can be really great in their absence.

I wish I had some fresh items of high art to write about. But the contentions of small politics have drained me dry; I have drunk at no new fountains of inspiration, and the old are familiar to you. I keep your friendship sacred; I have got a new hat, and an overcoat with wings; everybody says I am looking very well — as to health of course — as to beauty I don't take testimony now you and Sallie are in Europe; but I do feel terribly dragged, and awfully rebellious that everybody doesn't do just as I want to have them under every varying freak of my disposition. It does seem to me as if I was just missing doing something, being somebody, and as if life was turning, and the downhill begun. Well, if there could be no jolts and disturbing thank-you-marms why it wouldn't be so much matter, perhaps.

In July, 1870, Mr. Bowles went to Europe, in company with a nephew and another young friend. They crossed the continent to Dresden, hindered in their journey by the torrent of troops that Germany was pouring over her railroads into France,—"it was like rowing against Niagara," said Mr. Bowles,— and joined his son and daughter and Miss Whitney. The party traveled together in Switzerland for six or seven weeks. Thence he took the two ladies to Berlin, to get them comfortably settled in their winter quarters, and returned home by way of England.

To Charles Allen.

STUTTGART, GERMANY, September 18, 1870.

I have kept, you see, very closely to my purposes — to see Switzerland and to play — at least not to work all the summer

through. I write now, only to re-assure you of my friendliness and frequent and tender thought; to acknowledge your interesting letter; to congratulate you on the completeness of our triumph in H. & E.; to say that it removes all opposition to your withdrawal from the attorney-generalship; to hope you will not be a candidate again; to tell you I have been constantly growing in health and strength, and have had a very pleasant vacation so far,— though a little too hurried by the eagerness of the young folks; to say we had the delightful surprise of meeting the Galbraiths at the breakfast-table this morning, and that they go along with us to Heidelberg to-morrow; to tell you how the sad accident to L—— sorrows us — I fear another long trial for her from it; to report my return in the steamer of October 5th arriving 18th or 19th, without Sallie, — going meantime to Cassel for two days and to Berlin for four, where I leave this branch of the family for the winter; to ask you to remember me most affectionately to your mother and L——, and to Mr. Davis, James, the Governor, "Warrington," Bird, etc.; most cordially to bespeak your presence in Springfield the Sunday after my return; to give you the children's most hearty greetings — and to tell you, again and again, that I am most faithfully and heartily your friend —

To Miss Whitney.

October 5, 1870.

We are going down the Mersey,— mercy on us,— and before I get sick I want to write my affection to you,— it still lives! — and more especially the comfort your note gave me on reaching Liverpool last night. It makes me alike very proud and very humble to have you speak of the pleasures of the summer and my contribution to them for you,— as you do. I feel that it has been very successful and very pleasant,— to me,— and I know I owe much of it to you and dear Sallie. To have you feel that you owe its joys to me, in like degree, is very delightful, and yet very strange, almost — it would be quite, if I did not know how capable you and Sallie are of idealizing me, and surrounding me with a halo of goodness and sweetness that is drawn only from your own dear hearts. . . . London greatly

impressed me this time, and I really was sorry I could not stay and see more of it. With an impressive vastness, it has impressive solidity, many elements of beauty, constantly improving streets, squares, parks, and promenades, finer stores than any city but Paris, and a wonderful deal of the constituents of comfort. Vast improvements are going on all the time,— I recognized many since 1862. Somebody talks about Berlin supplanting Paris as the emporium of fashion; but the stores of Berlin won't compare with those of London,— no, nor of Liverpool. Berlin seemed cheap and unsatisfactory as a place for general "shopping,"— London incomparably rich. All substantial things in the way of dress and convenience are to be had better here than there, and generally cheaper, too. Articles of mere taste and luxury are probably to be better bought on the continent, but I wish I could have outfitted you girls in stockings and wraps and trunks and bags in London,— I would have at least made a barricade against the cold. Which reminds me that I forgot to say,— I think,— in Sallie's letter, that I bought a Cardigan jacket for myself — for twenty-five shillings! — that is lovely,— so warm and fine and well made,— just the thing for such cold-blooded people as you. And yet you couldn't wear just such things. But you are going to dress warmer. Kate H—— puts you to shame in that line, with thick sack-coats and wraps. But I must not get on my hobby to-night,— though I don't mean to let it wholly alone till I have reformed at least one woman!

Thursday noon, 6th. We are getting toward Queenstown; the sea is tolerably smooth, and nobody is sick,— the weather a struggle between fog and rain and sunshine. The passengers grow better on acquaintance; there are few or no swell people, and no more of vulgarity,— most of them plain, common, well-behaved folks,— a much better representation of America, I imagine, than we find on the crowded Cunard boats. The steward seems a surly, ill-natured fellow; the captain does not look winning; and the table is apparently poorer, certainly poorer served, than on the "Main." All this makes little difference with me,— I draw my discomforts, as well as my comforts, from deeper fountains. Kate is kind and cheerful and a

good sailor, and thoughtful of my comfort, as is Tom, and I feel reasonably cheerful about the voyage. . . .

I sent you the *Daily News*, postage prepaid, for one month; it is the Liberal paper with which Mr. Godkin was formerly connected, and has the best war letters and news, and costs less than the *Times*. If it reaches you promptly, and you would like it continued, let me know at home, and I will arrange it through Mr. Smalley. The postage is the main cost in papers, in this instance double that of the paper itself, though I can but think it is a mistake, and that a penny is the true paper postage to Prussia. The *Nation* seems to have stopped coming; I will have it sent regularly to you, and the Weekly *Republican* to Sam, with the hint to him that after he has had it over one Sunday, he must pass it over to you girls for a week, including a Sunday. This is better than paying postage on two,— better have a different paper; but if it does not work satisfactorily, let me know. I want you to see the *Republican* regularly,— both of you. Don't fail to let me send you the London paper, if you find it valuable to you.

No, Maria,— neither you nor Sallie nor anybody else in any way responsible for me should deceive yourselves, nor try to deceive me, as to my broken vitality. I know too well the difference between health and weakness,— between the consciousness of power, the overflow and exercise of which is a genuine joy, and the consciousness of weakness, when expression and even endurance is an effort, and instead of a bubbling spring, comes through a hard-worked pump, the very employment of which is another burden. I have felt the one, and nobody ever reveled more joyfully or more wantonly in its luxuriance; but now — save in rare moments of inspiration and excitement — I feel only and too keenly the other. I am not and never can be what I was once in power and in expression; I go into no presence without feeling that I am comparatively powerless — that I cannot rule or reign more. To the few I hope to make patience and philosophy and sweetness serve the loss in part,— but how the power lags upon the endeavor and the hope! I know I must draw continually on

the affection of friends and family,— and know that with you and Sallie I shall not draw in vain.

Good-bye, my beloved friend — take good care of my girl and boy — and my friend too.

November 18, 1870.

. . . Miss ——— is with us for a few days, and is as ever a thoroughly alive person,— quite too much so for the peace that passeth understanding that I am cultivating. Her father's death leaves her without an object or an occupation in life, and the hunger for inspiring and satisfying work is preternaturally strong in her; so she is thinking of joining a sort of Low-church Episcopal sisterhood in Philadelphia that is engaged in charitable labors. They live in one house together; they have a hospital under their charge; and go out to "days' works" among all classes of the poor and vicious apparently — but do not distinguish themselves by any special costume, or go in for any special mortification of the flesh. There seem to be a good many such organizations connected with the Episcopal churches in the cities. Some of them take on a discipline and dress akin to the Catholic orders; but Miss ———, who seems to have looked into the matter practically, complains, as I have found reason to from my limited observation, that there is quite too much heart for the head in this work — it is unintellectual, undiscriminating, and unorganized. Oh for the man or the woman who could give form and expression to the abounding philanthropy of the age! It is *the* problem of the hour,— how those who would may help those who should be helped; how all these pressing social evils, against which our poor hearts and heads beat so tenderly and so unavailingly, shall be reconciled with progress and growth,— and harmony grow out of our jarring discords, and strength out of our besetting weaknesses. There is an immense field here for the growing powers and the enlarging activities of women; but we do not seem to be getting at and into it in the best way.

. . . I want the war to stop; it has gone as far as I can intelligently follow Providence, and so I grow anxious on His account — lest it grow beyond Him, as human folly sometimes seems to do. . . . Oh, you and Sallie would have rejoiced

at my surrender to a grand gown of Mrs. ———'s last Sunday. It was just the thing for you, with all its wealth of velvet and silk and trimming. She is just about your "figger," as Artemus Ward would say; but you have not endowed any man with the glory of paying for your clothes at such a "figger" as she has. But it *was* a gem of a gown.

I am really better than I have been since last November. I came up very nicely after my vacation, as you predicted I would. Of course I do not shake off wholly any of the chronic elements of my weakness or suffering; but they are certainly lighter in their manifestations. Work comes hard, however; I have no keen relish for it, and do not accomplish a great deal. And yet, shirking all I can, it presses on me constantly. I really am busy all the while — and I presume, do the best I can, shall drift down and down again till next summer's vacation comes. I wish I could better command my life, and I do try — but the situation is not favorable.

But good-bye. Love for all of you in due proportion and the appropriate sort — take largely — help yourselves generously — and yet you will not exhaust.

To his Daughter.

December 9, 1870.

I believe this is Cousin Maria's week; at least I had promised myself a letter to her; but I have not time to do justice to either of us — and with one's children we can take any liberty, you know! So I scrawl off a sheet to you, and beg you to sugar-coat her till the next mail — if so it may seem necessary!

I had a very interesting evening and morning in Hartford; seeing a dozen of the brightest men thereof, ministers, lawyers, and editors, and having a long and valuable discussion of taxation, with many queer developments of facts and opinions. I saw Mrs. Stowe's husband for the first time; big, burly, sledge-hammery, with a loud voice and a good deal of intellectual power — whose intellectual fires only pale before his wife's. He looks like one class of German professors,— poor clothes, red nose, opinionated, and wise; or an old-fashioned country New England tavern-keeper, the oracle of the village. I staid

at General Hawley's; his wife is an invalid of long standing, but a very sweet, interesting woman; of the blood that makes the Beechers so prominent — the Footes' — of which family was old Beecher's first wife. Last night Kate and Sophie H—— were at our house; we read some of Bret Harte and talked of him, and then an hour of eucher. Kate has grown better since she came home, and looks immensely stronger and brighter and even younger than when we saw her at Lucerne.

. . . The weather! Oh that you girls could have been here this fall! America has done her best — except in not raining, nights — these three months. No country could do better anywhere; it has been and is marvelous still; and in justice to your own, your native land, you should have experienced it all. I am so mad that I can't be out all the time and enjoy it, and let it do me the good it was made to do. If I could have added these three months in American travel with the same charming company — *curtsey*, if you please! — to those three months, it does seem as if I should have been renewed, regenerated, and disenthralled, as the stump orators say in calling out the voters just before election. But I am pretty well for me. Work tells on me. Play fattens me. Working or playing, I wait for July and you.

January 2, 1871.

Wish you a Happy New Year, and t'other girl, too! It is four weeks to-day that your last letters were dated, and two weeks since they were received. So we are hungry, and jealous of the sea that holds our belated loves. Mother is very well for her; at church yesterday; down street to-day; but I hear her voice in its nervous key occasionally when ——— is around, or the boys get run over sliding downhill. I was in Boston Friday night and Saturday — home on the midnight train — and saw lots of folks; an evening at the theater; an hour at the Woman's Bazaar; an hour with Mamie, who is having the nicest of times; a half-hour call at the Morrills'; and a dinner with the Bird Club. I wanted to stay over Sunday and rest somewhat after so much dissipation, but Mother was alone — we do miss Mamie so much — and I had a budget of matter to write out for the paper — and so I came back. Christmas was

moderate with us; my chief presents were a China *tête-à-tête* tea-set from Jessie B——, and an embroidered towel-rack from Lizzie R——, both teetotally undeserved and unexpected; and the only present of consequence I made was an Astrakhan muff to Mamie. We kept our Christmas partly at home and partly at the Kings'. The papers have a story that I have left the *Republican;* I almost wish it were true; but it doesn't look like it, and I can't afford thus to bereave myself. Good-night. I circle you with my affection — the sea is wide; my arms are short; but my love is large and long, and overleaps time and space.

January 27, 1871.

Little to write save the old, old story, and no time to be sentimental. Mother is off in New York, having a good time, I guess, though suffering from needless remorse. We are carrying the balance of the children through a round course of odd cold attacks. Bessie is the last one, and she is down to-day. But it is nothing serious; she suffers but little — a stupid possession of body and brain, with some fever. The others are through with it.

I am weary but pretty well. Not quite through with D. D. Field yet. The correspondence is beginning to make a stir. It will hardly escape the papers. The general opinion is that I have beaten him badly. And would *you* believe it, everybody wonders at the sweet serenity of my temper! As if, and if!

I love you all, and think of you all — and wish you were all at home, and reasonably and properly in my arms.

The *Republican* this week is pretty much all mine — Pacific Railroad — Subsidies and Ships — Gen. Grant — Oakes Ames — Yale College — Paris and Peace.

February 3, 1871.

Dear All Three! I can give you but a hasty scrawl to-day. The week has been crowded and exciting. Besides the fall of Paris, the Field correspondence came out, and Hiram K—— has been married. Then Mother is still away, but everybody is well; she is apparently having a good time — a week at the Walkers'; now with the Runkles in N. J.; to-morrow she goes

over to Nellie's in Newark, and I imagine will not come home till the end of next week. I only fear she won't get rest enough out of it all.

The response to the Field correspondence is various. You will gather some of it from the *Republican*. I get kicked and cuffed some, but praised more. The victory is with me, on the whole — all I deserve, I am sure. Field is evidently a good deal disturbed, and is influencing the New York papers all he can by self and friends. The mild tone of the *Tribune* and the *Nation* is due to personal influences, though privately they greatly applaud me. Then Godkin has felt very keenly the thrusts of "Warrington," and Sanborn's occasional criticisms. Even journalism has its human side. Aside from the tragedy of this business, there has been considerable fun in it; and I don't think anything I ever did is likely to make more glory and fame for me personally than this. But it is "too late" now. I want a few thousands more income rather than larger notoriety.

You will see my late editorials on the same theme; but I mean practically and personally to dismiss it with that of this morning. But I wish you could all pore over my bushel of letters and newspaper extracts. They would amuse you in various ways.

I am going to the theater to-night with Mamie; and to-morrow I shall go somewhere for the day, and perhaps over Sunday; perhaps Woodstock, perhaps Boston. I am weary, and want a change of thought and scene.

Next week I will be more coherent and personal. Meantime my best thoughts and prayers go out to you; my hunger for your return increases — and oh! how I wish I could be dropped down in the midst of you for a few days! — and my love goes and abides.

To his Wife.

WASHINGTON [Winter of 1871].

You see I met Senator Corbett on the cars, and he so strongly urged me to come and stay with him that I consented. At New York I met Mrs. Calhoun, and at her rooms Mr. G——,

whom we met in the West, with his wife, a pretty and engaging young woman, whose parents live in California, and whom he met in Nevada. They came on with me yesterday, his work being here. It was very cold and rough in New York, and I spent my time there down-town, and saw no other women. I dined with George Wilkes and Mr. Billings, and saw General Joe Hooker, now badly paralyzed, but very interesting. I find much to interest me here, and many people to see, and shall stay as long as I can, but I don't believe this will be more than a week. I am getting better on the whole — gaining in sleep and tone. I have seen Mr. Dawes, General Walker, the Colfaxes, and a few others. All are well. Everybody inquires tenderly and interestedly after you, and sends love, and wishes to see you.

I wish, dear Mollie, you would try my plan for keeping well. I believe you could reduce your sufferings two-thirds by doing what I have so often suggested — thus: 1, A cup of weak tea or coffee before leaving your bed; 2, a fire in your room before you get out of bed whenever it is at all cold or damp; 3, do not get up when you are tired or sleepy, or so long as you can sleep; 4, stay in your room whenever you have the asthma or the sick headache, until you are relieved; 5, be careful of your diet — two good nutritious meals, one with fresh, tender meat — no cake nor pastry; 6, use the front parlor, and have an open fire there; 7, never go to the front door, or into the hall when the door is open; 8, never write in the evening, nor read an exciting book; 9, have a fire in your room at 8 to 9 P. M., and get to bed by 10; 10, drive out every tolerable day, say from 11 to 12; 11, walk out a half-hour in the afternoon, before 4 P. M., if it is pleasant, but go nowhere. Now, for what you deny yourself in these things, you will make up in additional strength and happiness. Have somebody come to see you every day. Read newspapers more. Read light books more. Study things that make for fun and peace. Do all you can or wish about the house, but take no responsibility,— and let care "slide." I believe you would find all this to "pay," and that you will not only be happier for it, but make everybody about you happier, too.

To C. W. Bryan.

February 10 [year uncertain].

You see, my dear Bryan, I couldn't say it yesterday, though I wanted to. Not altogether unwarned as I was, yet the magnificence of the gift overpowered me. I am glad to have it, and from nobody so glad as from you. It shall cease to beat time when my heart ceases to beat in cordial and affectionate tone to your life. It stands here, representative of long years of unity and coöperation, ripening into intimate friendship,— so it shall stand, as pledge and hope of still longer and richer years of joined life and labor, and sweeter and holier friendship. As works of art, both clock and poem are surely to be treasured; but as works of the heart they have a greater value and a longer life to and with me.

To his Daughter.

Home, March 17, 1871.

My spring vacation leaves me a generous harvest of experiences, fatigue rather than rest, but change that serves as the next best thing. A day and night at Cousin Nellie's, a Sunday with the Calhoun-Runkles in New Jersey's wilds, and a night with the Olmsteds on Staten Island, were high among the real and resting enjoyments of the fortnight; while full and free consultations with Senators Sumner and Schurz, Speaker Blaine, Secretaries Delano and Creswell, many representatives, and some of the ablest and brightest newspaper men of the country; dinners and breakfasts *ad libitum;* a charming half-hour with Harriet Prescott Spofford; a morning in New York with Bret Harte, and a lunch party with him given by me at the Brevoort House, with Dr. Holland, Law Olmsted, and Dr. Barker for the other guests; and a previous lunch party to me by our old Mr. Bridgeman, meeting half a dozen of the best New York newspaper men — these were my main intellectual dissipations and inspirations, and kept my brain active — and eke my stomach, too! Bret Harte is brighter and nicer than I thought, and was very frank and kindly with me, and promises to come up with his wife and make us a visit.

Indeed, he planted a hope that he might settle down in Springfield for the summer. He is very happy over his flattering prospects. At home, there is nothing new; we are all pretty well; Ruth is a breeze from the north-west, and Dwight from the south, all the while; Bessie is dainty and shy and quaint and strange, and Charlie is enterprising beyond his power; while Mamie is growing more and more womanly, and Mother says more and more like Cousin Maria, every day.

. . . I believe I wrote something in my last to Maria about my summer plans — but I wrote so hurriedly, with a man waiting at my side to take me off, that I have forgotten what. Of course I am obliged to consider the necessity of taking a vacation myself. I am sorry I have to,—for there are many reasons why I would prefer to stay at home all this summer. But I do not dare to hope that I might or ought or could. The necessity, like all *musts*, grows irksome and a trial. My first plan is this — the one I think on the whole best, all things considered: Mother to go over the last of June and spend July and August with Sam in Great Britain; you and Cousin Maria, if she would, to return — after a week or two in England, or a visit to Cassel — in July, and come to our house, and visit me, and then in cold blood send me off in August to Colorado for six weeks, and remain behind, Cousin Maria as long as she would. 2. If Mother can't be induced to go over, and you and Cousin Maria would like it, to spend July and August in England, I to join you for six weeks, and all come home the last of August. This is Mother's plan. It has its attractions to me — of course! — but yet I do not quite approve. So happy and successful a summer as the last it seems impossible to repeat. What do you all say to this or these? But good-bye. My time is up. I pray for your good health and happiness, and do take care of yourselves, and give me tender thought through the pleasures of Italy.

April 11, 1871.

We just got your last Berlin note — March 26 — with its atmosphere of whirl and P. P. C's and baggage-packing. The heat of conflict was still on its sheets! Of course, B—— will, like a sensible girl as she is, take what she can get and not

strive for the unattainable. She is a good traveling companion for that reason, and, I hope, will temper the *furore* of the all-conquering passion of the immortal three! Do take things comfortably — see what you can well and calmly — and *ab uno doces omnes!* That's Latin, if it is spelt right! — I may direct next to Rome, and the week after to Florence. As you do not give your programme, I have to fire somewhat in the dark. . . . Suppose Paris is disquiet? What? First, I shall be greatly disappointed for you all. Secondly, I suggest for your consideration that you go north to Cassel for a few days, — and go over to London by June 15, take lodgings and a French teacher for a month — and then! — You do all need to get away from Germany, and study continental questions from an outside point of view. If it cannot be in Paris, then London offers the most for you every way. Consider this idea seriously. As to my going over, I must leave it an open question for so long as I can. I do not give up Mother's seeing that it is her opportunity and duty both, and going in my place. That failing, as it threatens to now, there are other questions for me to consider, and I cannot "cut" them at once, — the health and condition of the family — the state of affairs at the office — the great "issoo" of the finances, etc. Let me keep them open, and do you keep patient. Sea-sickness even has its claims. But it is a delightful dream that I may be convoyed around England for six weeks by you four! It would turn the head of a younger and less philosophical old cove than myself. I am glad you have drawn it mild as to clothes in Berlin. I believed you would not find what you wanted; my Berlin suit is an abomination in style and make. You will have an opportunity to do more and better in London or Paris. And after all, there is nothing gained in goods or style, and not much in cost, by buying abroad instead of at home. We are improving in all respects over here, faster than ever; you will notice great changes in two years; and then again there is no real economy in laying in large stocks of clothes. Sufficient unto the day, etc. Moreover, I am coming very much to the conviction that it is alike principle and duty and comfort — and alas, something of necessity as well — to order our personal

life and dress more and more simply. At home, I intend to put life — furniture, dress, table, equipages — more and more on a simple, practical, and thoroughly useful and comfortable footing. The vice of American society is display; it is ruining our characters and in too many cases destroying virtue; and we must set severe examples — especially as we prefer to spend our money in other ways!

There is nothing new with us. The spring is very early and very beautiful. I am dieting on beef tea, and nursing myself for the spring campaign, but continue to be better than for several springs.

"Mother's plan" prevailed, and Mr. Bowles spent July and August in England with his two children and a party of American friends, sometimes to the number of nine, including Francis A. Walker and several ladies. "What struck me most in him in that journey," said General Walker, "was, not that he had the quickest and keenest eye for everything that was to be seen,— for that was a matter of course,— but that he found his greatest pleasure in the pleasure of others. To see his young people enjoy was more to him than to enjoy for himself. In determining the course of the party, his question always was what the others wanted most to see." The responsibilities of traveling conductor of the party were committed to his son. Mr. Bowles was not eager for sight-seeing, and often staid behind while the others went on, one of them usually staying with him as a companion. Nowhere else did he lay aside responsibility so much as in Europe. He took that as his pleasure-ground. He made guide-books and couriers the servants of his pleasure, and not his masters. What he cared most for was to catch the general aspect and spirit of a place. He sauntered more thoroughly than he ever could at home. The *Republican* was out of reach and out of hearing; so was all the rush and whirl of public affairs and

private responsibilities. In England he and his party tasted at leisure the lovely scenery of Devonshire, visited London, glanced at the cities of the North, saw York's incomparable minster, and Edinburgh on its queenly throne, and met a few people of note, among them Sir Charles Dilke and Miss Isabella Bird. These English days, like those on the continent in the year before, belonged to those happy times which leave no history.

Not long after his return in the autumn he took his wife on another trip of a few weeks in Colorado, where they visited his old friend General John Pierce. In the four years, 1868 to 1871, he traveled more than during any other equal period of his life. These long journeys were permitted by the well-equipped and prosperous condition of the *Republican*, and their pleasure and benefit were heightened by the company of his wife or children. In none of them, except the first visit to Colorado, did he write anything to the paper, or much to his private correspondents. These travels left little record from his pen. But they were put to better use, and it is scarcely doubtful that from them he accumulated some reserve of power. In Europe especially he really did lie fallow, or as near it as was possible for him. It served as a husbanding of forces to meet the sharp demands of the future. The events of the next year, both public and private, were to summon his every resource into action.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

The Greeley Campaign.

AS Grant's first administration approached its end, the dominant thought in the Republican party was still to guard the results of the war. So far, this had been done. There was submission everywhere to the general government; the negro was free, and a voter. Moreover, at the North there was general prosperity. The disposition was strong in the Northern people to keep what they had got, and to let well enough alone. And for that end Grant seemed a sufficiently good President. He had not made a brilliant success; Grant in the White House had proved a very different man from Grant in the field; but his personal hold on the country, though weakened, was not lost. The people generally felt that he was a safe man — and, with the wounds of war still smarting, its alarms still recent, safety was what they most cared for. On the other hand, the men who were in politics to serve their personal ends — the place-hunters, the intriguers, the managers of financial and political rings — were quite satisfied with the facilities they enjoyed under his administration. He was honest, but he was simple — as simple as when, a few years later, an adventurer cheated him out of his fortune. His natural sympathy and affiliation were with men of material forces. As the New York *Tribune* said,

after his death: "He never acquired the faculty of valuing men for their devotion to principles." Of the group of party chiefs in the Senate and House, no one had acquired any such prominence as to hopefully challenge the first place, and they found their common advantage in allying themselves with Grant.

But his strength with the honest mass of the party was that he represented security for the results of the war. Those results had been so recently disputed,— even by the resolutions of the last Democratic national convention,— and the condition of the South was still so unsettled, that a watchful jealousy was very natural on the part of the North. It was natural, inevitable, that the real change in the situation should not be so soon appreciated by the average voter. But the more forward spirit wanted progress. They knew it was not enough to hold the South submissive — it must be won back to active loyalty; its white people must be enfranchised as well as its black; the interference with its local self-government must terminate. They knew that fresh dangers were at work, that greed of money and of office were debauching the government, that the party machinery was establishing an ignoble despotism. They knew that when the highest avowed aim is to guard the past, the real movement becomes a retrograde, and the only safety is in going forward. The reformers, like the honest conservatives, had their camp-followers — discomfited politicians, who sought revenge on the Administration, like Senator Fenton, and his friends in New York, whom Grant had discountenanced in favor of Conkling, and who brought to the reformers such dubious alliances as the Barn-burners had given to the Free-soilers in 1848.

The Republican reformers had three lines of strategy open to them: to stay in the party organization and make

their influence as potent as they could, or to initiate a new organization, or to ally themselves with the Democrats. The difficulty with the first plan, in 1872, was that Grant's renomination was seen to be inevitable, and it was hopeless to look for a reform administration from him and the men associated with him. As for the Democrats, they had openly represented, until within a twelvemonth, the reversal of the whole reconstruction policy; and they still included whatever there was of hostility to the black man's rights, and the majority of those who sought to repudiate the national debt. That such a party should suddenly become of itself the leader of progress, was hopeless. There remained to the reformers the course of starting a new party — molded by Republicans, as a guarantee against any undoing of the past — but calling the people to forsake the organizations based on old issues, for one which faced the future.

The Liberal Republican movement of 1872 was initiated in Missouri. The division of that state during the war between a Unionist and a Secessionist element, had left in the dominant party a bitter and proscriptive temper, against which some of the more generous and sagacious members protested, and when protest failed they left the organization. Under the leadership of Carl Schurz and B. Gratz Brown, the Liberal Republicans held a state convention toward the end of January, 1872. Their resolutions laid emphasis on the pacification of the South, the reform of the civil service, and reduction of the tariff. They summoned a national convention to meet in Cincinnati.

The call attracted little attention from the country at large for a number of weeks. The winter was a time of political quiet. But the drift of events favored the Cincinnati movement in two respects,—it became clear that the Republicans would renominate Grant, and the Democ-

racy more and more inclined to the "passive policy" of leaving the Republican dissenters to take the lead in a party of opposition. In the beginning of March Senator Trumbull announced his adherence to the Liberals. Senator Sumner had not committed himself. At this time Mr. Bowles made one of his trips of observation to Washington and reviewed the situation from there. He found the capital, as he always did, the stronghold of selfishness and faithlessness. Through the connivance and silence of timid congressmen, he wrote, and the activity of the senatorial cabal, Grant's renomination was assured. The Democrats stood passive. The Cincinnati gathering was to be a purely Republican affair. It might only debate and resolve. It might make nominations,—Sumner and Trumbull, for instance, or Trumbull and Greeley. "I do not believe," wrote the sanguine man, "that either party could rally half its followers against such a nomination. I doubt if either of them would try."

Politicians, especially successful politicians, were for a time shy of the Liberal movement. Its ablest advocates were in the press. In February the New York *Tribune* declared that as the tariff was to be a leading issue, its protectionist convictions would keep it apart from the Liberals. But with the growth of the movement, revenue reform lost something of its prominence. Let that question be left aside, said the *Tribune*, toward the end of March, and we will "go to Cincinnati." The *Nation* and the *Evening Post* represented a different element of support. The Chicago *Tribune* and the Cincinnati *Commercial* were powerful advocates in the West. The Louisville *Courier-Journal* gave active sympathy from the side of the Democrats. The New York *World* was friendly if Mr. Adams was to be made the candidate. The *Republican's* active support began from Mr. Bowles's

visit to Washington. The paper's ability and its popularity among the whole constituency of editors gave it prominence as one of the half-dozen leading journals of the Liberals.

In April the Liberal cause seemed full of promise and power. There was no longer doubt that it would nominate a presidential candidate. The new party became attractive enough for place-hunters and intriguers to begin to flutter toward it. The regular Republicans meanwhile went on in a listless way toward the renomination of Grant. The Massachusetts convention, April 10, declared for Grant and Wilson, glorified the past of the party without stint, and made no recognition whatever either of past errors or new issues. There were very few of the party's better class of leaders in the convention. But only a very few prominent Republicans in the state showed favor to the Liberal cause. Among them were Frank Bird, Edward Atkinson, Elizur Wright, "Warrington," and General W. F. Bartlett. It was plain that in New England at least the mass of the people were yet unstirred. The *Republican* could not but be fully conscious of the hostile or indifferent atmosphere around it. Just before the convention, April 29, its appeal was:

"Shall the government be administered in the interests of the whole people, or, as in late years, in that of a party, a faction, or a person? Shall the people retain the right of local self-government, or shall they be governed more and more from Washington? Shall the memories and rancors of the war be perpetuated by a policy of proscription and hate, creating a disaffected and restless Poland in the Southern states, to be a constant source of uneasiness and peril; or shall the powerful instincts of patriotism and national unity, dormant for a season but never quite dead, be allowed full play under a policy of generous amnesty and reconciliation?"

much sense and benevolence as he. Other men made of the *Tribune* a great newspaper; to him it was the mouthpiece of his own personality,—a personality of the utmost energy and picturesqueness. His writing was as lucid and racy as Franklin's; as weighty with passion and hard sense as John Bright's; and copious beyond either, as the daily journalist exceeds in copiousness the essayist or parliamentarian. His sympathies were generous and humane; his religion was simple and genuine. His heart was with the common people; he had shared their experiences, he spoke their language. His culture was defective, and he had the fault incident to deficient culture,—ignorance of his own limitations. He was liable to be most dogmatic on subjects which he knew least about. In his beliefs, his instincts, his enthusiasms, his prejudices, he was as thoroughly a representative American as any man of his time. He had served many great reforms; he had followed some whimseys and hobbies; he had promoted the spirit of humanity and political and personal virtue more widely than any other American journalist. He was irascible, petulant, and magnanimous. His temperament was liable to sharp ebb and flow. No man would do more courageous things; few men were more subject to panic. Living in the midst of the busiest, most practical world, and himself a part of it, he was in many ways utterly unpractical. On a question of direct and simple morality, or pure sentiment, he was always to be trusted; in the region of intellectual theories he was uncertain—by turns sagacious and childish; in personal contact with men he blundered continually. Such a nature, when finding its favorite field and passion in politics, could not but yield a surprising mixture of results. Emerging from the war and reconstruction, his own impulses drew him, not toward the new questions, the intelligent reforms, but back to

his first love before the anti-slavery struggle,—high protection. Shrewd New York politicians had sometimes used him as their tool. His training had been in a school — the same school to which Seward and Weed belonged — which regarded office as the be-all and the end-all of political discussion. To attain a desired and, as he regarded it, entirely honorable purpose, he did not hesitate to associate himself with men for whom he had no personal respect, and he was often made a cat's-paw. He had within the past two years identified himself with the Fenton faction; had for a time been president of a society consisting largely of Tammany Republicans; had, in a word, been entangled in very ignoble personal politics. With the cool scientific temper of the new school of reformers he was utterly out of sympathy. Revenue reform was to him a synonym of free-trade heresy. He wanted a pure public service, but the utter want of sagacity in his personal judgments gave little promise in this direction. His hostility to the Administration was considerably due to its adoption of Conkling's side in the local feud. Only at one point was he really in full sympathy with the new movement. He had from the first advocated reconciliation and magnanimity toward the South. When Jefferson Davis was lingering in prison,— the government afraid to bring him to trial lest a jury would not convict him, and afraid to let him go lest the North should disapprove,— Greeley by signing his bail-bond had facilitated his release, and had thereby raised a storm of disapproval against himself and the *Tribune*, which he faced with entire courage. He had favored the Kuklux and Enforcement laws, but had been consistently and earnestly in favor of universal amnesty, and now represented the sentiment of reconciliation perhaps more conspicuously than any other man in the North. For a year past it had been generally said, without any

A great deal depended upon wise management at Cincinnati. The hope, so the paper held, was in a reform, even through revolution, of the Republican party; in a change of its leaders, while holding the better class of its voters.

"We have no faith," it said, April 6, "in a reform party made up of the Democracy and a small per cent. of the Republican party, consisting perhaps equally of its disaffected office-seekers and its advanced and most courageous and most unselfish thinkers. We do not believe such a party will be formed; and we do not believe it will amount to much if it is."

The success of the convention in initiating a new movement seemed likely to turn on its nominations. The principles it was to declare were substantially known in advance. A week before it met the *Republican* named as the four men from whom alone the presidential candidate could with propriety be taken,— Sumner, Greeley, Trumbull, and Adams. To each of these it paid high tribute, but gave a strong preference to Adams. He was the favorite candidate among the men who imparted to the Cincinnati convention its highest character and strength. He had been a Free-soiler from 1848, and represented the early and purest type of Republicanism. When secession was impending, he had gone to the limit of honorable concession. As minister to England during the war, he had largely contributed by his firmness and discretion to save the country from a foreign embroilment. He had had no part in the legislation or politics of the reconstruction period. By inheritance, by culture, and by experience, he was qualified for a high post in public affairs. He had never sought office, and never refused his service when the state asked it. He was called stiff and cold,— that he would show a grim front to schemers and plunderers there was no doubt. He was a kind of survival

from the austere type of the republic's earlier days. How far he would be acceptable to the modern and democratic nation, or could adapt himself to it, might be doubtful. But to the reformers he seemed a type of that intelligent, courageous statesmanship which was the need of the new epoch. Democrats could support him without sacrifice of self-respect; and next to the Cincinnati *Commercial*, the Louisville *Courier-Journal* was the most serviceable advocate of his nomination. His indifference to his own candidacy was a kind of merit. Leaving the country just before the convention, to serve as the American representative in the Geneva Board of Arbitration, he answered a letter on the subject from David A. Wells in a careless and half-defiant tone. Nobody, he was confident, wanted a man as isolated as he was for a candidate; he valued his independence vastly more than office; the principles avowed by the Liberals were good; his friends' mention of his name was very kind, but he would not "peddle with them for power"; they might take him or leave him! This letter Mr. Bowles gave to the public, and believed it helped his candidate. For the success of that candidate he was very earnest. Yet in writing from Cincinnati he recognized as objections which had some weight, the doubt of Mr. Adams's ability "to organize and impact a party, after his election," and "the traditional capacity of the Adamses for disintegration rather than organization."

To the mind and the eyes of the whole country, there was no more familiar figure than that of Horace Greeley. The big round face, the spectacled blue eyes, the fringe of white whiskers, the slouching farmer-like figure, the pockets stuffed with newspapers—were known to every New Yorker. He was as well known to the whole country by his words. No man of his generation talked to the common people so forcibly, so clearly, and with so

much sense and benevolence as he. Other men made of the *Tribune* a great newspaper; to him it was the mouthpiece of his own personality,—a personality of the utmost energy and picturesqueness. His writing was as lucid and racy as Franklin's; as weighty with passion and hard sense as John Bright's; and copious beyond either, as the daily journalist exceeds in copiousness the essayist or parliamentarian. His sympathies were generous and humane; his religion was simple and genuine. His heart was with the common people; he had shared their experiences, he spoke their language. His culture was defective, and he had the fault incident to deficient culture,—ignorance of his own limitations. He was liable to be most dogmatic on subjects which he knew least about. In his beliefs, his instincts, his enthusiasms, his prejudices, he was as thoroughly a representative American as any man of his time. He had served many great reforms; he had followed some whimseys and hobbies; he had promoted the spirit of humanity and political and personal virtue more widely than any other American journalist. He was irascible, petulant, and magnanimous. His temperament was liable to sharp ebb and flow. No man would do more courageous things; few men were more subject to panic. Living in the midst of the busiest, most practical world, and himself a part of it, he was in many ways utterly unpractical. On a question of direct and simple morality, or pure sentiment, he was always to be trusted; in the region of intellectual theories he was uncertain—by turns sagacious and childish; in personal contact with men he blundered continually. Such a nature, when finding its favorite field and passion in politics, could not but yield a surprising mixture of results. Emerging from the war and reconstruction, his own impulses drew him, not toward the new questions, the intelligent reforms, but back to

his first love before the anti-slavery struggle,—high protection. Shrewd New York politicians had sometimes used him as their tool. His training had been in a school — the same school to which Seward and Weed belonged — which regarded office as the be-all and the end-all of political discussion. To attain a desired and, as he regarded it, entirely honorable purpose, he did not hesitate to associate himself with men for whom he had no personal respect, and he was often made a cat's-paw. He had within the past two years identified himself with the Fenton faction; had for a time been president of a society consisting largely of Tammany Republicans; had, in a word, been entangled in very ignoble personal politics. With the cool scientific temper of the new school of reformers he was utterly out of sympathy. Revenue reform was to him a synonym of free-trade heresy. He wanted a pure public service, but the utter want of sagacity in his personal judgments gave little promise in this direction. His hostility to the Administration was considerably due to its adoption of Conkling's side in the local feud. Only at one point was he really in full sympathy with the new movement. He had from the first advocated reconciliation and magnanimity toward the South. When Jefferson Davis was lingering in prison,— the government afraid to bring him to trial lest a jury would not convict him, and afraid to let him go lest the North should disapprove,— Greeley by signing his bail-bond had facilitated his release, and had thereby raised a storm of disapproval against himself and the *Tribune*, which he faced with entire courage. He had favored the Kuklux and Enforcement laws, but had been consistently and earnestly in favor of universal amnesty, and now represented the sentiment of reconciliation perhaps more conspicuously than any other man in the North. For a year past it had been generally said, without any

disclaimer on his part, that he was a candidate for the Presidency. He craved appreciation and recognition from the people he had loved and served, and he believed that he could in office promote the good causes he had at heart. That he could serve those causes better in the *Tribune* than anywhere else,—that his genius was not for administration, but for thought and speech,—it was not given him to see. He did not seek the nomination, but he allowed others to seek it for him, and men who had their own ends to serve were very active in pushing his name at Cincinnati. He was favored too by some who cared chiefly for Southern conciliation, and by some who thought that his candidacy was best adapted to arouse a popular enthusiasm.

The convention met,—a nucleus of intelligent and high-minded men, with a fringe of nondescripts and adventurers. The Adams men had something of the independence of their candidate. They held themselves aloof from maneuvering and log-rolling. Mr. Bird had come by way of Washington, whence it was hoped he would bring the adherence of Mr. Sumner to the convention and the Adams candidacy. He found Sumner sympathetic toward the movement, but hostile to Adams and in favor of Trumbull. Present on the ground, though not as delegates, were the five leading independent editors,—Whitelaw Reid, Murat Halstead, Horace White, Henry Watterson, and Samuel Bowles. Mr. Reid's "independence" was a temporary investment. He exchanged it — when he had gained his end in becoming master of the *Tribune* — for a most deliberate and unscrupulous partisanship, as an article better suited for the ordinary market. The four other men had a large sympathy with each other, as to politics and journalism, but there was no definite league between them, then or afterward, and no agreement of perference as to a candidate. A scheme was set on foot, by some of the Illinois delegates,

with covert assistance from Senator Fenton and other New Yorkers, to nominate David Davis. The project became known, two days before the convention met, to the little knot of independent editors. They agreed to coöperate against a movement fatal to the integrity of the convention. The common protest of their respective journals the next morning put an effective veto on Davis's candidacy. This brought Greeley to the front, as being now the real candidate of the New York delegation. When the convention opened, Mr. Schurz was made its president, and in his address gave worthy expression to the true purpose of the convention. He had not hitherto declared himself for any candidate, but he sketched in broad lines an ideal which was recognized as suggesting only Mr. Adams. The convention did not ballot until its third day. The delay was caused by a struggle in the committee on resolutions. There were a number of strenuous revenue reformers, who resisted the general disposition to drop from the programme an issue which would alienate elements indispensable to any chance of victory. Their opposition was fruitless; it was decided to relegate the tariff question to the people in the congressional districts. The pertinacity of the doctrinaires lost them the sympathy of the convention, and they had wasted the strength they might have employed against the candidacy of the foremost of protectionists. The resolutions were condensed and spirited; they were emphatic as to maintaining the principles of the great Amendments, and the rights of the freedmen; they urged a full restoration of the Southern communities to their normal constitutional relations, a practical oblivion for the old sectional quarrel, and a radical reform of the administrative service.

At last began the critical work of nominating a presidential candidate. Meantime a new force had come into the field. Gratz Brown had held an honorable posi-

tion, dating from early anti-slavery days, in the local politics of Missouri; he fancied that he might be the candidate of Cincinnati, and the state delegation gave him the compliment of a nominal support. While Schurz indicated his preference for Adams, Colonel Grosvenor, leader of the Missouri delegates, declared to them that Brown had no chance for the Presidency, and urged that they support Adams, and claim for Brown only the second place on the ticket. It was telegraphed to Brown that he was being betrayed; and in company with Frank Blair he hastened to Cincinnati, burning with mortification and resentment, and bent on revenge. His purpose to defeat Adams was discovered late at night by two of the keen-sighted editors; Bowles telegraphed it to the *Republican*, and Halstead gave conspicuous warning in the *Commercial*,— but it fell on incredulous ears. The first ballot showed Adams first, Greeley next, then Trumbull, and Brown hopelessly behind. Then Brown took the platform and made a speech withdrawing his name in favor of Greeley. It was, and was meant to be, the hardest blow he could strike at his old friends. There was surprise and dismay; Mr. Schurz went apart to meet the Missouri delegation with an appeal for Adams; only one-third of them at first followed Brown for Greeley, and the rest compromised on Trumbull. Schurz resumed the president's seat, and Brown continued his efforts among the delegates. The balloting went on; Adams kept the first place; his friends recovered from their alarm, and grew sanguine. The sixth ballot came; Adams's nomination seemed a certainty. Then a few delegates transferred their vote to Greeley; others followed them; the convention was seized with one of those inexplicable, contagious enthusiasms to which all bodies of excited men are liable; Greeley's striking personality, his popularity, his friend-

ship for the South, all lent themselves to swell the wave which surged through tense nerves and swept the impulsive and wavering into its current. Mr. Greeley was nominated!

The ardor of that moment was not for an instant shared by the men who were the real strength of the convention. The rest of the work was hurried through: neither Trumbull nor Cox would accept the vice-presidential nomination, and it fell to Brown,—without bargain, and in the natural course of things; but it was the one drop of bitterness which completed the discomfiture of the reformers. Except Mr. Reid, the independent editors were all profoundly disappointed, and some of them doubtful what course to take. None of them felt keener disappointment than Mr. Bowles. But when some of their number came together in the evening, his voice was clear and emphatic,—the only thing was to support Greeley. To the same conclusion came the editors of the *Commercial*, the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Courier-Journal*. Mr. Bowles's private dispatch that night to his lieutenants at home instructed them to accept the nomination, but "not to gush!" After a day so full, so exciting, so disappointing, he sent off his midnight dispatch to the paper, relating the event, recognizing the mistake, and taking the most hopeful view:

"No persons," he wrote, "more thoroughly than Mr. Greeley's brethren of the press recognize his great worth, his large and varied ability, the vast obligations the country is under to him; but they object to his high protectionism, to the manner in which his nomination was secured, and to the miserable set of small and jobbing politicians and often corrupt speculators that have so long and so thoroughly surrounded him, and influenced him alike strongly and perversely in much of his political conduct. They fear the continued power of these influences over him in the larger sphere to which he is

now invited and exposed. . . . The Irish will respond to this nomination as to no other. The workingmen will, by genuine instinct, recognize in Mr. Greeley their steadfast friend and co-laborer. The negro vote will be more than divided in his behalf. The farmers of the West have read, studied, and profited by Mr. Greeley too long and too much not to feel the impulse to rally around him. Mr. Adams's strength would have worked from the rich and cultivated and business classes down. Mr. Greeley's will develop from the laborer, the poor and discontented, up. He is, perhaps, the ablest representative of the American workingman. His fellow-workingmen will recognize him as such, and they will break the bonds of party. They will ignore the circumstances of his nomination; they will forget the weaknesses of the man and the dangerous influences that will surround him in a greater or less degree in the White House; they will laugh at the jokes and caricatures at his expense, and they will vote for and elect him. He does not stand for all the reforms that the country demands, but he represents many and the largest and noblest of them — the return to peace and its offices and instruments, the reorganization of parties, the reduction of the cost and power of the army and navy, the multiplication of the means by which government blesses the people and ministers to their every-day comfort, the increase of official respect for popular opinion, and the decrease of the influence of mere partisanship in our government, and the limitations of the power of the executive over its offices and patronage — and his election will freshly illustrate and powerfully advance the cause of representative government."

Even from this sanguine view it was plain that the reform movement had suffered a radical change of character by the nomination of Greeley. Of the men who had initiated that movement, and of the class to whom it had originally appealed, a part were altogether repelled and a part were chilled and half-hearted. The *Nation* and the *Evening Post* withheld their support from the first. The strong revenue reformers were of course

antagonistic. Even Mr. Schurz for a number of weeks took no personal part in the canvass. He openly said, when at last he gave his voice in favor of Greeley as preferable to Grant, that for some time after the convention he had hoped the issue might yet be made up differently. The *Republican*, too, had for a time a lingering hope that in some way Mr. Adams might be made a candidate.

The Democracy drifted somewhat hesitatingly but unmistakably toward the formal indorsement of Greeley's candidacy. Their support was the one thing necessary to break down the strength of that candidacy among Greeley's old constituency. At first it was only the party organs and zealots who treated him as an apostate. When he joined the Liberals, early in April, the New York *Times* indeed declared the act to be "the crowning folly and crowning treachery of his life"; for the *Times* was a business rival of the *Tribune* as well as the bitterest of Administration organs. But as it grew apparent that the old Democrats, including Southern "rebels" and Northern "copperheads," were to furnish the bulk of his support, the still hot embers of anti-slavery and war sentiment began to kindle into flames against him.

The Republican convention met at Philadelphia early in June, and by formal ballot gave its substantially unanimous nomination to Grant. For Vice-President, Henry Wilson was substituted for Schuyler Colfax. He had for seventeen continuous years done hard-working and useful service in the Senate; he was not an especial partisan of Grant; and he represented the more moderate section of the party. Mr. Bowles attended the convention; reported it with candor; acknowledged that it was "a great success," and that "at present the omens are certainly on the side of Philadelphia."

He recognized the substantial, intelligent citizenship written on the faces and in the words of the delegates, though not finding the enthusiasm of earlier Republican gatherings. The members, he said, were "business men, materialists, men of fact and reality,—not reformers, not leaders in principles; and those satisfied with the present, who postpone revolutions and improvements for another four years. But even this second class of the old Republican party is of no mean quality of men."

In July the Democrats met at Baltimore, adopted the Cincinnati platform word for word, and indorsed the Cincinnati nominations; there being little opposition to this policy, though Senator Bayard spoke strongly for maintaining the party on its own independent basis. The indorsement by the Democracy of a life-long opponent, however extraordinary on its face, was by no means inexplicable. Nor was it to be explained simply as a snatch at the offices,—a great popular party cannot be sold for a cheap and open bribe. In truth the whole class of national questions on which the Democracy had long been contending was now irreversibly settled against them. Reconstruction, equal suffrage, the great Amendments, had become fixed facts. The party had no standing-ground except in opposition to the methods and spirit of the Administration, and on this they could fairly join hands with the Liberals. Greeley's strength as a Liberal candidate was on the very issue that came closest home to the Southern wing of the Democracy,—the deposition of the carpet-baggers and the full restoration of the Southern communities to their normal constitutional relations. It was honest and wise for them to accept his nomination. On the other hand, among the Northern Democrats there was rising some genuine spirit of reform. Even in New York the corrupt leaders of Tammany had been deposed, and Tilden and

his allies were initiating a genuine and vigorous civic renovation. It was the turn of the tide with the Democratic party,—the point where it was passing from an attitude of blind obstruction, and becoming once more a useful political force. But the acceptance of a candidate who for thirty years had been denouncing the Democracy in the most vigorous terms the language affords, was a change too sudden for success. The more bigoted elements of the party in the North could not be won to support him. At the same time the mass of Republicans took fresh alarm at seeing most of their old opponents on the battle-field and at the ballot-box rallying to his support.

The campaign put the *Republican* in a very trying position. It was published in a community whose Republicanism was almost as deep and solid as the red sandstone of the Connecticut Valley. Its editor's convictions were carrying him counter to the great majority of the paper's subscribers and readers, and to most of his personal friends. In the eyes of most of his readers he seemed associated with a reactionary cause, and with the imperiling of results which they and he had labored together to win. But this was not the worst of the situation. One may endure much in a "hearted cause"; but though Mr. Bowles was fully convinced that, on the whole, Greeley was preferable to Grant as President, yet neither the Liberal candidate nor the party supporting him were at all such as he would have desired. Nobody understood better than he that in nominating Greeley the Cincinnati convention had turned its back on that type of educated, scientific, reformatory statesmanship which he and his associates had been seeking. At the very outset of the campaign, he had had a personal experience of his candidate's peculiarities. The morning after the nomination at Cincinnati, the *Commercial* pub-

lished a New York dispatch as to Mr. Greeley's reception of the news, containing this sentence: "Mr. Greeley stated that he would be glad to see the lies Sam Bowles had been circulating to the prejudice of Senator Fenton contradicted." Mr. Bowles replied in a temperate note to the *Commercial*, repeating, substantially as told in this chapter, his account of the personal influences which had brought about the nomination,— "added, of course," he continued, "to Mr. Greeley's own high personal qualities and popularity, and the deep hold he has acquired upon the people of the South and the West. But with his usual perversity of temper and openness to flattery, Mr. Greeley will probably continue to give his faith and attribute his success to those who fawn upon him, and use him, and slander and abuse those braver and truer friends who dare to expose them to him and the world, and tell him the truth that he needs to hear, even if he does not like it."

As the canvass went on, the appeal taken originally to the best intelligence and culture of the nation, resolved itself into an appeal to a single generous sentiment. The practical alternative to four more years of Grant had become an administration which the *Republican* frankly owned (July 26) would be a "political hurly-burly and party interregnum." It was for a candidate so far from satisfactory, in a cause so unlike the ideal cause, that the *Republican's* editor was obliged to stem the tide of popular conviction, sentiment, and prejudice.

He met the ordeal in a way which showed how much may be gained in gallant service in a forlorn hope. The *Republican* gave to Mr. Greeley a support not uncritical but substantially friendly and true. It defended him manfully against the bitter aspersions of partisans, the ridicule of the caricaturist. It protested in fit terms against the severity of the *Evening Post;* Mr. Bryant, it

declared, was too entirely the opposite of Mr. Greeley to do him justice, and had influenced his juniors, until they all "look at Greeley's mistakes, his vanity, his petulance, the infirmities of his nature, through the most powerful of magnifying-glasses; and they are stone-blind to his great services and his shining virtues." It was a like error which led the *Nation* to characterize the nomination of Mr. Greeley as "the final attempt of that large class of quacks, charlatans, ignoramuses, and sentimentalists who are engaged in every civilized country to-day in trying to substitute the heart for the head — or, in other words, to make singing, weeping, and wailing do in politics the work of memory and judgment — to get possession of the government of the United States."

Hardly ever has a candidate whose record was so patent to the world been made the victim of such misrepresentation. A false Horace Greeley, said the *Republican*, is being held up to scare the people, — "but they will not be deceived; they know the real man — the robust strength, the sound mind in the sound body, the healthy alert conscience, the tireless energy, the generous devotion, the sturdy backbone."

The *Republican* was frank in recognizing the dangers incident to the character and position of Mr. Greeley, and in balancing them against the evils on the other side. It said, June 28, that some of the worst men in the country, and especially in New York, were making themselves conspicuous as his supporters, that he must shake them off, and as President would probably do so.

"He may yield and blunder and fail in little things; in great things he can probably be trusted to be true to himself and the people. At any rate the risk is worth taking, in view of the great good to be secured, — the final pacification and genuine reunion of these states; lately at variance, now bound together for all time to come in the imperishable republic." "General

Grant," it continues, "has affiliated as President with politicians of a very bad sort. He surrendered to them long ago and has ever since allowed himself to be 'run' by the Mortons and Tom Murphys. He lives and moves and has his being in an atmosphere of materialism; and he has neither the power nor the wish to rise above it. He does not even seem to understand that there is anything higher and better; he acts as though he held it the whole duty of an American president to enjoy himself in his office, punish his enemies, and make the 'patronage' go as far as possible in national and local politics. If Mr. Greeley sins in this way it will be with his eyes wide open. No man can feel the pulse of public opinion more skillfully than he; no man if raised to the highest office would feel it more diligently."

Amid the heats and confusions and rancors of the campaign, the *Republican* laid steady stress on one idea,—reconciliation between North and South. This it declared to be the vital issue. The hearty acceptance of Greeley by the Southern whites it held as of great significance. "It means that *the war is really over*." It preferred to enlarge on this generous theme rather than to reiterate the charges against Grant's administration which were pressed home in the speeches of Sumner, Schurz, and Trumbull. This line of attack was very tempting, in the absence of strong claims for the prospective Greeley administration; the *Republican* employed it to some extent, but its favorite plea was for a full restoration of the Southern people not only to political rights but to confidence and regard as fellow-citizens. This was the subject most urged by Greeley himself, who made a series of very admirable speeches as the campaign went on.

The stronghold of the Greeley advocates lay in the sentimental aspect of this question. Of practical measures, they had little to offer as to the Southern problem.

Questioned as to what a Greeley administration would do for practical reconciliation, the *Republican* specified universal amnesty, civil rights for the blacks, and withdrawal of power from the carpet-baggers. But amnesty itself had become chiefly an affair of sentiment, since Congress had in May passed an act of amnesty to all except a few hundreds. This was a measure of great importance. Its passage was probably due to the influence of the Cincinnati convention, and proved the most tangible gain to the country from that event. It was also a wise move for the Republicans in a party sense, for it deprived Greeley's supporters of one of their most substantial arguments. The most solid advantages they now proposed for the South were the cessation of interference with the state governments and the withdrawal of support from the carpet-baggers. In Greeley's words: "The men who are robbing South Carolina to-day would be on a dead race out of the state two days after they heard that another government was to be installed in Washington." But to many cool-headed men, it appeared that the installation of the Democratic party was less likely to hasten the process of restoration than to hinder it by provoking reaction. The younger C. F. Adams, in accepting Grant as the least of two evils, said: "Whichever party is successful this year, the vile scandal known as carpet-baggism is doomed, and the states lately in rebellion are sure at last of being left to themselves."

After the Southern question the most prominent problem of the canvass was the business interests of the country. Mr. Bowles, writing from the Philadelphia convention, recognized that these interests were likely to tell in favor of Grant:

"Money-bags are always and everywhere conservative. When you have proved to the busy wealth-seekers that the

President has shown an indecent fondness for gifts, that he has appointed rascally or incapable kinsmen to office, that he has cracked if not broken the laws, what have you accomplished by your denunciation? They will reply to you, 'General Grant is a safe man. The country has prospered and its credit improved under his administration. We know him and know that he can be trusted not to smash things. It would be folly for us to take the risk of a change. Let well enough alone.'"

The *Republican* urged among the solid gains from Greeley's election, the overthrow of party tyranny, and also a check to the materializing influences in politics.

"The railroad rings, the banking rings, the iron and coal rings, the money-grabbing combinations of every name and sort, are clear in the conviction that one good turn deserves another, and have come down handsomely for the general campaign fund."

It declared, no doubt with truth, that lavish bribery was used to carry the Maine and Pennsylvania state elections for the Republicans. The disclosures of the Credit Mobilier corruptions were foreshadowed in the autumn; a quarrel of one McComb with his old partners, Oakes Ames and others, drew from him the statement that congressmen had received stock on terms so favorable that it was virtually a bribe; and names of congressmen were mentioned. But Ames and other parties implicated gave the broadest denials, while definite proofs were not forthcoming, and most people set the matter down as a "campaign slander." The *Republican* threw all the light it could find upon the business, and called for investigation; it believed that there had been corruption somewhere, but it was very careful in accusing individuals; and its comments as read in the light of after revelations were moderate and fair.

During the whole canvass,—with passions running higher and higher; under the exasperation of an unde-

sired candidate, an uncongenial alliance and a growing prospect of defeat,—the *Republican* showed a temper which, if not saintly, was calmer, cheerier, and incomparably fairer, than most men exhibited in public or private. Day after day it printed the speeches and articles of the Grant orators and editors beside those of the Greeley advocates. It gave the political news as fully and fairly as if it had been indifferent to its bearings. It avoided personal denunciations of Grant, while Greeley was being assailed with every form of abuse. The campaign was very bitter in its personalities, but the heaviest sins in this regard lay with the Grant party. Mr. Curtis's decorous editorials in *Harper's Weekly*, which well expressed the Republicanism which was at once reformatory and cautious, were accompanied by Nast's cartoons, depicting Charles Sumner as weeping over the grave of Preston Brooks, and deriding Greeley as fiercely as before they had derided Tweed. Mr. Dawes described Greeley as one likely to make Captain Semmes of the "Alabama" his Secretary of the Navy and declared: "He who cries against the Republican party cries only from the rebel stand-point." The *Republican* had now and then a waspish word, but such was not its habitual speech. As to the main issue of the canvass, the treatment of the South, it exonerated Grant for personal responsibility for the mistakes of the past. It said:

"The people saw that a strong hand was needed at the helm, and they believed that General Grant had such a hand. So they elected him, and gave him his orders to protect the negroes and to make the rebels behave themselves. He has obeyed those orders. General Grant is entitled to fair play. There is reason to believe that he has deprecated at heart the unnecessary harshness which has been used; that he has sometimes even gone as far as to discourage projects for additional repressive legislation; that he has been strongly overruled by

the advisers he has chosen, and who until quite recently have consciously had public sentiment behind them. No, if General Grant is refused a reëlection, it will not be because he has failed in this reconstruction business to do what the people wanted and expected of him. It will be simply because the people themselves have got around on the other side of the question, and are looking at it from the other point of view; because from being stern and nervous in 1868, they have become good-natured and tranquil in 1872; because they no longer want what they wanted four years ago, but something very different."

It urged its readers (July 26) to moderation and good-temper.

"Don't commit the common but extremely foolish mistake of setting down all the members of the other party as either fools or knaves, either led by the nose by designing leaders or governed by the lowest motives. They are nothing of the sort. They are your neighbors and fellow-citizens, bone of your bone, flesh of your flesh. They love this great grand Republic as well as you do and are as incapable of consciously doing it a mischief. . . . Don't allow yourselves to be troubled by what the editors and stump-speakers on the other side may say of you. . . . Don't get into a sweat over the idea that the country is in some dreadful danger, that if this or the other man is chosen President the next thing on the programme will be a trip to the 'demnition bow-wows' with no stoppages. . . . General Grant means a good deal better than he does. He hasn't made a very good President certainly. He lacks the natural fitness and the training which ought to go with that very difficult and responsible office. But he is neither a gloomy despot nor a plotter against the liberties of his country. . . . On the other hand, we assure our readers that Mr. Greeley is neither a fool nor a knave, but an honest and exceedingly able man, who loves his country and has a respectable acquaintance with its affairs."

As to the local nominations, the *Republican*, amid an odd mixture of friends and foes, supported in some cases

the Republican and in others the Liberal nominee. Chaos seemed come again when Massachusetts Democrats nominated Charles Sumner for Governor,—an honor which Mr. Sumner declined; Mr. Bird being substituted for him. The passages at arms between Mr. Dawes and the *Republican*, some of them sharp ones, did not prevent the paper from supporting him for Congress. Sometimes its independence had an infusion of caprice. When General Hawley as a candidate for Congress was matched against William F. Eaton, the bitterest of anti-war Democrats, the *Republican* favored Eaton, as being committed to higher ground on the new issues. In this case probably, perhaps in some others, its philosophical independence was tinctured with a spice of mischievousness,—a touch of what in another it would have called "pure cussedness."

The struggle drew toward its end, and when a Republican victory in Maine in September was followed in October by a large Republican majority in Pennsylvania it was no longer doubtful what the end would be. It had hardly at any time been doubtful. The elements of the country which held the balance of power were much of the mind which the *Republican* had expressed in April: "We have no faith in a reform party made up of the Democracy and a small per cent. of the Republican party, consisting perhaps equally of its disaffected office-seekers and its advanced and most courageous and most unselfish thinkers." Greeley had against him not only strong forces of prejudice, passion, and materialism; the intelligent conservatism of the nation was largely distrustful of the uncertain and chaotic administration which might follow his election, and preferred the known and measurable evils to be expected under Grant.

Election day came, and Greeley was beaten as scarcely ever was one of the two leading candidates beaten before.

Only Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, Georgia, and Texas gave him their electoral votes. Grant's popular majority was almost three-quarters of a million,—not far from double his earlier majority over Seymour, or Lincoln's over McClellan. Greeley's own state had given more than fifty thousand majority against him; Massachusetts, seventy-five thousand,—more than two to one; Pennsylvania, against the great protectionist, a hundred and thirty-seven thousand. In the newly elected House of Representatives, the Republicans had a majority of a full hundred, where in the previous House they had less than thirty.

To Horace Greeley the result was a death-blow. His rugged constitution had long been remorselessly overworked, and the excitements and labors of the canvass might have brought it to the danger point even had the issue been favorable. He returned a few weeks before the election from a tour in the West, where the elation of his own admirable speeches and their favorable reception had warmed his sanguine nature into visions of triumph close at hand. He came back to find his wife on her dying bed; to watch beside her nightly for weeks, almost without sleep; to find his defeat foreshadowed by the Pennsylvania election, and culminating into overwhelming rejection by the country a month later; to see the *Tribune* crippled and imperiled by its disastrous campaign; to sink into acute nervous prostration; to die, a broken-hearted man.

In the bitterness of the final hour, his life doubtless seemed to him a failure and a wreck. We, who measure the whole of it, know that it was a grand success. He largely and nobly served his country, and he wrought out a character with "much to praise, little to be forgiven."

"The glory dies not, and the grief is past."

CHAPTER XL.

A Dissolution of Partnership.

THE deepest interests and strongest purposes of Mr. Bowles's life centered in his family and the *Republican*. His darling objects were to plant the newspaper as a permanent institution, and to make ample provision for his children. The most of his property was invested in the business of Samuel Bowles & Co. The printing and binding department was not less profitable than the newspaper, but in the newspaper lay his personal delight and ambition. He looked to no posthumous fame for himself, but he believed that he was founding in the Springfield *Republican* a great and enduring power. He felt that it was his life-work and his legacy to those who should come after him. The ownership of the whole concern was vested in several partners, the leading interest being his own, and the remainder being divided between Mr. Bryan, Mr. Tapley, and Mr. B. F. Bowles, and two or three owners of small shares, including Mr. Pomeroy and Mr. Phelps. The newspaper was under his editorial management, his brother was in charge of its counting-room, Mr. Bryan conducted the general printing business, and Mr. Tapley took care of the binding. Mr. Bowles came to the determination early in 1872 to dissolve the partnership and entirely separate the newspaper from the printing and binding department. The controlling

interest in the paper would then come into his hands, and could be transmitted to his family. In the language of the paragraph in the *Republican* which announced the change, he wished to "settle his own estate,"— to bring his property into the shape which he wanted it ultimately to retain. Another strong motive was the desire to free himself from care for the other departments of a business which had grown to large dimensions. He was the responsible head of the whole concern, and in such a position it was impossible for a man of his make to wholly transfer responsibility to the heads of departments. There was frequent reference of doubtful points to him. He felt that he could best lighten the load he carried by separating himself from active partnership with everything but the newspaper. The newspaper, too, he considered, would be more untrammeled in its freedom of expression if unconnected with any commercial interests except its own. When, as sometimes happened, its editorial criticisms fell on men who had dealings with the printing-office, there was a chance of unpleasant complications. To simplify his affairs, to gain more independence for himself personally and for the paper, to insure in ample season that his life-work should pass into the hands of his children,—these were the motives which moved him to seek a division of the business.

But there were factors in the case which made the separation a difficult and delicate matter. Other men than he had given to the joint business the best of their lives; others had sons; others felt for the *Republican* an affection and pride which could not be reckoned in dollars and cents. For twenty years Mr. Bryan had been his partner and comrade. A proposal to dissolve such a partnership was liable to be viewed almost as a faithful wife would regard the suggestion of a divorce. But Mr. Bowles did not fully foresee these difficulties, and believed they could be

sufficiently met by giving to Mr. Bryan a minor interest in the *Republican* under the new arrangement. There had been some mention made of a possible division, to which the other partners did not attach much importance. Mr. Bowles sought Mr. Bryan for the decisive interview on a Sunday morning toward the end of April, a little before the Cincinnati convention. He had been with his wife to church, and thence he went to Mr. Bryan's house and invited him to a walk. As they strolled through the Armory grounds Mr. Bowles said, in his direct and decisive way, that there must be a division of the concern into two separate firms. Mr. Bryan replied that such a change was against the interest of all of them—it meant the breaking up of an establishment which had been twenty years in building. Mr. Bowles said: "I'm tired of making money for other people." The word fell like a spark on the pride of the man it was spoken to. He understood the expression as applying to himself, though it was probably quite differently intended. His reply was a prompt assent to the demand for a separation. Mr. Bowles went on to propose that in the division of the firm into two separate concerns he should retain a minor interest in Bryan's and Tapley's establishment, and Mr. Bryan should keep a like share in the *Republican*. But Mr. Bryan rejected this feature; he would have no such palliation of the separation which he felt thrust upon him; let the division, he said, be complete. They parted and went to their homes, Mr. Bowles surprised and troubled that his action had been received as unfriendly, and Mr. Bryan deeply wounded that his old chief had cast him off. The two men in their different ways were equally proud and sensitive. When the other partners were consulted, neither of them was favorably inclined to the change. Mr. Bowles on his part felt aggrieved at the reception given to his proposal. In one of his notes

to Mr. Bryan, after he had found that Ben too gave consent only against his judgment and feeling, he wrote:

"Under such circumstances I can do nothing. It takes away all my courage to do what my judgment approves as the best thing, on the whole, for both departments of the paper, and at least for both you and me. It takes away too all my faith in myself to find I have inspired so little faith in me in others. I therefore propose to sell my interest entirely. If it is desired, I will remain in charge of the editorial department on a salary, or retire altogether if it is preferred. I must at least *begin* to 'set my house in order.' I must also at once resign all responsibility for the mechanical part of the paper. I shall be glad to join my counsel regarding it, but from its details I must be relieved."

But any such suggestion could hardly be entertained, — to carry on the *Republican* without Mr. Bowles, or to retain him only as a paid employé, was not to be thought of. Within three or four weeks a dissolution was agreed on, by the terms of which the two Bowleses were to retain the *Republican*, and Bryan and Tapley take the rest of the business.

An equitable division was made of the property. No injury to the material interests of either party was apparent thus far. But close on the heels of the separation came a new development. There had been for several years in Springfield an evening paper, the *Union*, which at present was neither vigorous nor especially prosperous. Its owner was approached by the agent of an unnamed party, with a proposal to buy it. The price of $50,000 was agreed upon. The buyers were the recent associates of Mr. Bowles. Their purchase of the *Union* was announced before the end of May. It was to be continued as an evening paper by Clark W. Bryan & Co. The special opportunity of the new enterprise lay in the political situation. In supporting the Cincinnati nomi-

nee for the Presidency, Mr. Bowles had gone counter to the well-nigh unanimous sentiment of the old Republicans in Springfield and its vicinity. The opposition to Greeley had a heat and passion which was a direct inheritance from the days of the war — a war not yet ten years distant. The disruption of the *Republican* establishment was in no degree owing to political differences, but Mr. Bowles's old associates were personally inclined to political orthodoxy as against the Cincinnati heresy. At the precise juncture when they found themselves, from owners in a great newspaper, reduced to the proprietors of a printing-office and bindery, there came the room for a newspaper politically opposed to the *Republican*, which should challenge its supremacy in its own town, yet as an evening paper have a distinct field. Mr. Bryan and Mr. Tapley sought an ally in William M. Pomeroy, long time the *Republican's* managing editor. He accepted the offer so attractive to the editorial heart, to become a chief instead of a subordinate. The new concern also made proposals sufficiently favorable to win Mr. E. H. Phelps, the *Republican's* local editor. The *Union* had, from the start, the political sympathies of by far the greater part of the *Republican's* old constituency. Besides this, numberless people on whose toes the *Republican* had trodden in various ways welcomed an opposition paper. It speedily ran up a good subscription list. With this as a basis, it of course won patronage from advertisers who before had been restricted to the *Republican*. This competition drove the latter to lower its advertising rates. There was thus established a threatening business rivalry in a field of which the limits were so narrow as to hamper the *Republican's* ambition, even when without a competitor.

It was Mr. Bowles's desire to remain on friendly terms with his late associates and present rivals. When Mr.

and then followed its invariable policy toward its local rivals — absolute silence. But it was part of the *Union's* stock in trade to attack the *Republican* and its editor. Its thrusts were often angry and personal, but it never could draw from the *Republican* a word of retort. As to his personal relations, Mr. Bowles "owned no smart and sued for no compassion." The alienations and censures which fell thick on him he bore in silence, or disarmed by good humor. Only one passing word in his letters betrays how the environing hostility affected him. He writes to his Colorado friend, "Uncle John": "Bless your dear, lazy old soul, for writing me so long a letter! It was the pleasantest surprise I have had this long dreary summer."

One of his Springfield friends relates: "Once during the Greeley campaign he came across the street to me as I was talking with some one, and said, 'Holloa! old fellow, I haven't seen you this long time.' 'I don't want to see you,' said I. 'Don't want to see me? Won't you come with me to Miellez, the florist's?' 'Well, yes.' Then when we had walked a little way, I said, 'Sam, I get so mad with your d——d paper, that I want to kick the whole thing into the street. You can't say a decent thing about the Republican party. I want to crush your whole concern.' He turned round in his winning way and put his hand on my shoulder, and said, 'T——, it's all for your good!'—and there was something in him that I couldn't resist."

But the division of the *Republican* establishment brought disastrous consequences, in one way or another, to all parties concerned. The *Union* proved a source of loss to its new owners. The old firm of Samuel Bowles & Co. had bought an expensive lot on Hillman street, intending to put up a building for their business; this property now was only a drain for taxes and interest.

In 1873 all real estate fell greatly in value, and the land was finally sold at a serious loss. The new labor and responsibility thrown on Mr. Bowles by the reorganization of the paper were like a weight upon the neck of a spent swimmer. He rose to the emergency, and to other emergencies which followed; he made the paper for a few years more brilliant than it had ever been before,—but it was a brilliance which consumed the last energies of his life.

CHAPTER XLI.

Letters: 1872.

THERE is sometimes a kind of unfairness in giving only one side of a correspondence — a course which is made necessary in the present work by limits of space. The reader is in the position of one who listens to a man talking through a telephone. But the imagination may probably be trusted to supply the missing half of the dialogues so far as to prevent any serious injustice to Mr. Bowles's correspondents.

To Charles Allen.

May 11, 1872.

It was one of the finest experiences of a life-time, that at Cincinnati — full of fun and feeling and history. The two men who made the most out of it were Adams and Schurz. Adams has come to the first place in our politics, quite suddenly and quite unexpectedly. My review of the convention, which I hope you read, told the whole story. There was a fate above logic and superior to reason, that brought about Greeley's nomination. How it will work out it is impossible to say. But my optimistic eye gives me great hope of the result. Philadelphia can nominate nobody but Grant, unless it is Adams,— and Adams stands on the Cincinnati platform. Baltimore can nominate no one but Adams also. Neither convention will be up to that. Philadelphia will nominate Grant. Baltimore will acquiesce in Greeley. The contest will be between Greeley and

Grant, and we shall all go for Greeley and he will be elected. Always except Boston, of course, which has no more conception of what is going on in the world than the South Sea Islanders themselves. Greeley has magnificent qualities, and has done more for political reform and social reform, Republican advancement and Democratic elevation, than any man living. Then he has more first-class weaknesses than any man, too. There are risks in taking him, but compared to the benefits, they don't begin to be as great as those under Grant, and the present condition of affairs. Anyhow the country out of New England is ripe for a revolution.

To H. L. Dawes.

May 21, 1872.

I am serene but sorry. My boat is in deep water and I anticipate no difficulty in paddling it successfully through the billows of the coming campaign. Greeley has great possibilities in him. What will come to him personally it is impossible to say now. But this thing seems to me already assured — a grand break-up and political revolution. That is what Cincinnati meant. If Adams had been nominated it would have swept through Massachusetts powerfully, as I told you. Now we may measurably escape it, and wake up next November to find that the world has moved on pretty rapidly while we have been standing still. I do not see how you Washington politicians can change the situation much now. You had it in your power three or four months ago, as I told you again and again, to have shaped and directed and controlled this whole business. Now it has passed out of the hands of the White House and Congress, of Republicans and Democrats alike. You may be able to modify it, but you have got to accept a good deal more than you can direct. I do not see how Grant is to be thrown overboard with any advantage at Philadelphia, nor how the Democratic convention at Baltimore can escape acquiescing in Greeley. Of course there will be a Bourbon ticket as a place of refuge, but it will be as weak and powerless as the Bourbon Whig ticket in 1860. The desire of the South to be forgiven, and to have their sins forgotten, is an appeal that the most of this country will

respond to, so soon as they recognize its sincerity, and the acceptance of the Cincinnati platform and Horace Greeley as the candidate is certainly about as good token of sincerity as whipped rebels and the Democratic party could give. Another thing that will "come of it" is an almost entirely new Congress. The men who have been contriving in your body for their own reëlections are going to be disappointed. The old is passing away, the new is coming to the front. In another form and with another feeling, it is a Know-nothing movement over again.

You certainly have won a brilliant victory personally, on the tariff. I hope you will stay in Congress long enough to win a better and a higher and a nobler one. It is not statesmanship, and you know it. But it is all of statesmanship, I frankly admit, that the present Congress is up to. It will add to your reputation and your power quite as much as it ought to. You are capable of greater things, and I shall be impatient with you until you have proved it. There is a better way of making a tariff than by combination or compromise of all the cotton mills and woolen mills and sheep farmers and pin factories and coal mines, of all the congressional districts of the land.

Yes—Fenton was for Greeley "in his way." But his way would have killed him. It was not the men of the Fenton stamp who nominated Greeley at all. Fenton may whine and Greeley may swear, but I told the truth about that convention and about Fenton. Fenton is neither a political idiot nor a political buccaneer, and Greeley was nominated by a combination of those two. The Theodore Tiltons and Frank Blairs, and not the Reuben E. Fentons, did the business.

If you keep your town meeting together till June 2d or 3d, I propose to spend those two days in Washington on my way to Philadelphia. I went to the first presidential convention of the Republican party, and I propose to close my convention-going career by going to the last.

May 28, 1872.

No,—I don't feel much "courage for the fight"; on the contrary, quite the reverse. Nor do I see only that which "ought to be." But I do see that I can't avoid making the fight, in my

own independent way; nor do I see any other line of influence or noble effort in this world except in behalf of ideals, at the same time being willing to accept that which is practical. I wanted Adams; I accept Greeley — because he is better than Grant, because he represents a higher plane of political thought and effort, and, above all, that putting aside of the old, and that reaching forward to the new, which is the first desideratum in our politics. I accept your tariff triumph — more, I am proud of you for having won it, and yet I do want to have you do something better, and I do believe you can. Because I am something of an idealist and enthusiast, don't believe I am a fool.

July 16, 1872.

I will see you Thursday as you go through, and I hope you will be able to let me have then your speech, or such a full sketch of it as will satisfy you. I should like every word. I am sorry you are going to make it. I believe it is all a mistake. If I were you, I should stay in my district and make one speech, explaining that while I could not leave the old Republican party, did not see my way clearly as many of my best friends did, to join in the new movement, yet I did see great reason for it, great hope for it, and that I did see many objections to Grant, and to the present tendencies of the Republican organization; still that I should stand by the party; hope, fight, struggle for it in my own independent way. Then I should ask for a reëlection from my constituents, on my own record, on my own services. The Grant organization would be obliged to renominate you, because you had not deserted it; the Greeley people would make no fight against you, but would, I think, acquiesce in you, perhaps openly support you as a subject of faith and hope. At any rate you could have a triumphant election and command your future. If the senatorship should be opened by Wilson's election — as is not now at all probable — you would have a double chance for it; first, through the Grant organization, and second, through an independent position and such a combination as was made in Connecticut.* I wish you had a

* This refers to the election of Senator Ferry by a combination of independent Republicans and Democrats in the legislature over General Hawley, the regular Republican candidate.

little more faith and a little more courage! There would be some risks, but they are not so great, nor so many, as in standing still and leaguing yourself with a faded if not broken and defeated organization.

Break your leg and don't go to New Haven!

August 22, 1872.

Angry — by no sort of means; simply very sad that you should have espoused your cause in the temper and style that you have. It only makes it the harder and the more unpleasant, both for you and for me, for the *Republican* to follow out its purpose in this campaign. It obliges criticisms frank and possibly severe, as the basis of support.

You said of Mr. Sumner, "Can personal hatred carry a man farther than this?" Perhaps this is not anger or bitterness exactly, but it is certainly along the line of it, and directly imputes the worst of motives to Mr. Sumner's action, and no severer attack could be made on such a man. I am confident you have thrown away sure advantage and great opportunities for a possible chance.

You had won national fame as an independent critic, a candid judge. I know that both supporters of Greeley and Grant recognize that in your late speeches you have assumed the rôle of an attorney and a partisan. I cannot and don't dispute your motives. I do arraign your wisdom and lament your action.

To Charles Allen.

July 28, 1872.

I don't expect now to be gone for long, no more than two or three days at a time, during the whole season. I have plenty of good help at the office, but yet find abundance to do. Somebody is away or sick most of the time, and it is very difficult for me to get any relief. But I am pretty well for me, and am standing it much better than I feared.

Butler will make a raid for the governorship if he dares; he means to if he can. What Sanborn reports on the subject is true. He has reliable sources of information from the Butler camp. But the result is likely to be as you say. Butler will

hardly find encouragement of his purpose. I look for Washburn's nomination by the regular convention and his reëlection, unless Charles Francis Adams should run against him. Then it would be doubtful. Washburn is doing just about as we expected — you and I. He is not up to the reformation and revolution for which Massachusetts is ripe, and waiting and suffering. They must come soon, either through a rough revolutionist like Butler, or a genuine constitutional reformer, like one of the Adamses. The best man to-day for governor of Massachusetts is Charles Francis Adams, Jr. He knows better what the state wants and how to get it, than any young man I know of. I could work for him with a relish. Bird wants to be the Liberal candidate, I suspect; but that won't do. At any rate, while I almost love the old fellow personally, I could not support him in the *Republican*.

To General John Pierce.

July 29, 1872.

My dear Uncle John: Bless your dear, lazy old soul for writing me so long a letter! It was the pleasantest surprise I have had this long, dreary summer. I am really glad to hear all about you, your trials, your ambitions, your sweet consolations, your high philosophy! I wish I could drop down upon you and "bully" you into youth and hope and vigor again. But I have got to give up my desire and expectation to go to Colorado this season; for that matter, to go anywhere. The exigencies of a presidential campaign for an "independent" daily newspaper are exacting for the responsible head; and I cannot afford to be away more than a day or two at a time, until after election. Then, if possible, and you will promise me better weather than you gave me last year, I will repeat my trial of your November climate. But I certainly cannot dream of going away so far before. I am pretty weary and nervous, but keep, on the whole, better than I had reason to expect. The rest of the family are all very well, I thank you. Mrs. Bowles and the four younger children are out on the hills, twenty miles away, enjoying the sweet simplicity of the country. Sallie and myself are alone at home; Sam is off on

a walk in the White Mountains; and Mamie is away for a few days at the sea-shore.

Of course I go for Greeley! It is not by any means the ideal thing, but it is infinitely better than the alternative, as you can see and feel. Why and how, you will also learn from the *Republican* which I send you. But your instincts, which are very apt to run on the same line with mine, will teach you still better than any words that I can write or print. If you come East, don't fail to come and see me, advising me a few days beforehand, so that I shall not be away. It would comfort me immensely to have a little visit from you, and I will take care that you don't get harmed.

Bear our affectionate remembrances to your dear wife and all our friends in your circle; and do write again.

To Charles Allen.

August 1, 1872.

I supposed young Adams was against Greeley, but that would not necessarily prevent him from being an independent reform candidate for governor. We are getting a good deal into the open field, and are not to be obliged, I trust, to vote for men for congress and governor and selectmen, on the ground mainly that they support one of two men, neither of whom we would have chosen for president. "Every tub on its own bottom"— that is the millennium of political effort. I am not "wrong" and not going to be, and I should like to lead you into earnest support of Greeley. It is the right thing. If you were an orthodox man and believed in total depravity and hell, you would belong to General Grant; but not being so, put faith in human nature, believe in progress, reformation, history! You ought to join this new and revolutionary political movement. You, and men like you, have no right to allow your distrust of Greeley to turn you aside from what is more important and greater than any one man's defects or capacities. I care nothing for Greeley by the side of the issues of this campaign. Nobody knows his weaknesses better than I. So far as the personal question is involved, I only know that he is a man of higher spirit, finer instincts, purer life than the other

one. Things cannot be worse so far as personal influence and direction go; they may be better. But all questions of administration are dwarfed by the larger meaning and wider beneficence of the general issue on the reform side.

To Mrs. Runkle.

September 13, 1872.

I have a great deal of hope, abundance of incentive to struggle, but I fear there is not time to ripen the great cause. In every struggle between the new and the old, between the ideal and the practical, the spiritual and the material, the grosser always wins the first victory. It is ours in the end; it ought to be ours now, by virtue of steam and electricity and daily press, quickening the thought and ripening the soul of man. And in this faith, or rather hope, I wait and labor.

To H. L. Dawes.

September 17, 1872.

I found your letter last night on returning from my usual Sunday vacation. I do not think you would have felt or written as you have, had you seen the *Republican's* first article on the McComb exposure [in regard to the Credit Mobilier]. It seems to me that it covers the whole ground of your personal integrity very completely, and I am sure nothing has been said since to break the force of that acquittal. I don't find in Saturday's paper the words you quote. I don't recollect their having ever appeared. If they did, they certainly were not intended to apply to you, or to demand of you to "prove your innocence"; our repeated declarations, and the *Republican's* open committal to your integrity, utterly forbade it. The original article, which I inclose — lest you may not have seen it — and the one this morning, which was written and in type before I opened your letter, seem to me explicit and full and satisfactory on the point of your personal complicity in the Ames bribery; and though the words you quote — if they have appeared in the paper — may be twisted into an inconsistency therewith, they ought not to have any force in your own mind,

as I am sure they have had none in that of the public, against the positive and pointed declarations both before and since. The article in the Pittsfield *Sun* was copied in obedience to that general rule, which we have adopted this season especially, of publishing everything for and against our friends, that has a peculiar interest for our readers. As the *Republican* had again and again within a few days expressed its confident belief in your innocence, and fully acquitted you of receiving any of the Pacific Railroad bribes, it did not seem to me called upon to enter a special disclaimer against the *Sun* article. Some of its points were simply absurd, others were pertinent, and all were of interest to the local public. It does not seem to me that either on this or any occasion the *Republican* has been wanting either in the disposition to vindicate your personal integrity, or the habit of defending in every way your personal character. Indeed I rather flattered myself it had been a more faithful friend in this respect than many of the presses and people who are now associated with you in seeking the rëelection of General Grant; and I do not remember a single occasion when either the paper or myself personally have failed to stand by you in this respect. I know very well that you have always in your private intercourse defended me, and I am sure I have not failed to appreciate it. But of the leading men in the Grant party who are I am sure my personal friends, — whose personal and political battles I have fought for years, and have been fighting even now during this campaign,— not one has felt called upon, either by a sense of gratitude or a sense of justice, to utter a single public word that would vindicate my private character, and put the authors of the falsehoods to shame. I do not complain of this. I feel a good deal as old Mr. Alcott did, who, when the boys in his school behaved badly, called them up and insisted on their punishing him as the person to blame. It seems to me it is my fault if my friends fail to treat me with that generosity and justice which I could desire.

I hope the *Republican* will not make me appear to be false to any true personal friendship, or destroy any of the genuine relations which I have had for years with people whom I esteem

and love. I do not mean, so far as I am concerned, that it shall do so. But it must fight its battle against corruption and incompetency and infidelity in public life and among public men, if it is at the cost of every personal friend I ever had. The *Republican*, I trust, is an institution. It is of vastly more consequence than myself, my feelings, or my fate. I don't mean to stand in its way.

September 20, 1872.

I hope you understand me and the *Republican* a little better. I welcome the tokens of it. You know very well that if you and Wilson and Washburn could tell what you actually know and what you morally believe about Oakes Ames's business and the other business at both ends of the avenue at Washington, I should be fully justified in all I have said about them; not perhaps in supporting Greeley — that is another thing; but in denouncing Ames as a briber and in opposing the reëlection of General Grant. Of course I cannot use, directly or indirectly, what has been said to me in private conversation; but I have a right to avail myself of what everybody knew who circulated at Washington among newspaper men and congressmen, and I am certain that I have not gone beyond that.

Of course, I presumed that you would feel obliged to make such a speech as you propose to; and if you are preparing it, I wish you would let me have the manuscript the day before, so that I can print it in full, the next morning. I cannot imagine that you will say anything that will annoy me, for I cannot see how you need to say anything about me at all. As for the *Republican*, it must take care of itself, and I presume it will. It has been taught to, by somewhat hard experiences of one sort and another.

I did not mean, any way, to arraign you for not taking notice of the gross personal attacks made upon me by your political associates. Whenever your private character has been attacked, either by Grant or Greeley papers, the *Republican* has promptly, explicitly, and repeatedly defended it publicly. So it has in the case of my friend Mr. George Bliss, Jr. But neither of you thought of addressing a letter to the New York *Times* — which it could not have denied admission — in vindication of my

personal character from its brutal assaults. I don't ask that it be done, I don't complain that it was not done; but I will be frank enough to say that I thought it might have been done.

In short, my dear fellow, as between us two, I don't think you have any reason to complain of me, and I have certainly none to complain of you. I appreciate your respect, your confidence, your affection, and respond fully to them all. As between the *Republican* and yourself, I think you have no right to complain. It seems to me the balance of benefit, of loyalty, of service, are all on its side. I know that it has tried constantly to serve you, protect you, and advance you, and that it has never omitted an occasion, that seemed to it fit and proper, to bear a hand in that direction. For no individual has it ever been so friendly, so persistent and unintermitting an advocate. It has asked nothing, expected nothing in return, save fidelity to your own ideals, consistency with your own standards. It must stand by its own, protect its own, however, above any personal service or any personal liking. It has arraigned you only when you were inconsistent with yourself, and when it seemed — with all the evidence before it — that you were inconsistent with facts and with candor. The free cordiality of its service obliges it to be sharp in its arraignment of these failures. Its past support would have been false, were not its present criticism frank; its future service would be barren, but for its present arraignment. It cannot be a friend save in and through truth.

November 10, 1872.

I thank you very much for your kind and generous note. You are generous, indeed, above most men with whom I have had experience, in being able to forgive me personally for the inability of the *Republican* to agree with and applaud you altogether. It hurt me very much to allow the *Republican* to differ with you sharply, on one or two points, and I hope it may not seem necessary to it to continue in such attitude. I don't know what I can do personally, or what the *Republican* can do, to help you beat Boutwell [for the senatorship]. But both I and the paper will be very glad to do whatever is possible. I still think most deeply that there was a better way for you to have

made your fight this year, and that, if you had made it thus, you would have occupied the proudest political position to-day of any man in this whole country. Still there is nobody who has come out of the canvass, on the whole, better than you. I am only sorry that it is not better than *everybody* else. You would have had several hundred more votes, if anybody had been at the pains to circulate Liberal tickets with your name in the place of Arnold [the Democratic and Liberal candidate]. I supposed, of course, that it would be done, or I should have interfered myself in that direction, at least in Springfield, where I think really everybody, save Trask and perhaps Merritt, was earnestly for you.

Do come and see me before you go away. Let me know in advance, and give me a full day and night at least. There are various things that I want to talk with you about.

CHAPTER XLII.

Grant's Second Administration.

IN American politics, since the Reconstruction period, the lines of the real issues and the lines of party organizations have not run together. On the surface the political contest has been between Republicans and Democrats; but the underlying and important struggle has been between the reformers and the obstructionists.

The tactics of the reformers toward the party organizations have varied. They began in 1872 by trying to establish a new party. The experience of that year taught them to try a different policy. Thereafter they urged their views on both of the existing parties, and as the one party or the other put forward the better measures or the better men, to that party the reformers gave their support for the time. This course was almost incomprehensible to that great mass of voters who are bound to their party organization by a tie not so much of reason as of habit, sentiment, and finally of inheritance; so that John Smith is a Republican or a Democrat because his father was one before him; and hardly asks himself seriously why he prefers his party any more than he asks why he prefers Mrs. John Smith to other women, or John Smith, Junior, to other boys. And he regards a man who "belongs" to neither party, but alternates between them according to their varying

merits, somewhat as he regards a man who has a variety of wives.

The experience of 1872 left many of the leaders of the revolt disgusted with defeat, with isolation, and with the Democratic party. The independents of following years came probably quite as numerously from the men who voted for Grant in '72. The New York *Tribune*, the Chicago *Tribune*, and the Cincinnati *Commercial* made their way back more or less speedily into the orthodox Republican fold. The New York *Tribune* floundered in a way that might recall Christian's fellow-traveler, in Bunyan's story, who tumbled with him into the Slough of Despond: "'Is this the happiness you have told me all this while of? If we have such ill-speed at our first setting out, what may we expect between this and our journey's end? May I get out again with my life, you shall possess the brave country alone for me.' And with that he gave a desperate struggle or two, and got out of the mire on that side of the slough which was next to his own house."

Horace Greeley was dead, past a doubt. But Samuel Bowles was alive, and so was his paper. It came out of the campaign beaten, but with colors flying. It maintained, through the following years, its attitude of genuine independence. To leave one's own party for an alliance with its opponent is an incomparably easier thing, demands far less of insight and self-control, than to hold an even balance, giving praise or blame, support or opposition, as in each case it is deserved.

The years covered by President Grant's second administration may be viewed with reference mainly to three topics,—the Southern situation, the currency question, and administrative reform. As the Republican party in the Southern states had been organized on the basis of the solid black vote, it was necessarily the party of

ignorance and corruption. Inevitably it was displaced from power in every state where the whites were in the majority, as soon as these states were left wholly free to act for themselves. The change proved greatly to the advantage of social order and prosperity. There were some states in which the blacks were superior or nearly equal in number to the whites, and there for a while longer the Republican party maintained a precarious ascendency. Louisiana was the scene of disorder and disgrace throughout this presidential term. The state election of 1872 was claimed by both parties. The Conservatives, as the Democrats preferred to call themselves, held that McEnery was chosen governor, while the Republicans, or Radicals, as their opponents called them, maintained that Kellogg was elected. The Conservatives, including most of the property and intelligence of the state, would have given practical effect to their recognition of McEnery, had the state been left to itself,—just as Maine was left to itself when its governorship was in dispute a few years later. But the faction led by Kellogg, Packard, and Casey had the sympathy and countenance of the Washington administration. From a United States judge, Durell, they obtained an order, under cover of the Reconstruction acts, which authorized them to use the United States troops. The sight of the uniforms was enough; no open resistance was made to Kellogg, though a large proportion of the people continued to regard McEnery as the legal governor. Durell's order was so palpably illegal, that two years later a committee of the national House, then a Republican body, voted in favor of his impeachment, and he only escaped by resigning. Both the national House and Senate showed the greatest doubt of the legality of Kellogg's tenure. But no action was taken toward reversing the wrong; the Northern people

were apathetic; public opinion, in the *Republican's* phrase, was in a doze. To some extent it was drugged, by the constant assertion that the Southern Democrats were full of the old rebel spirit, and that the blacks were overborne and terrorized.

The public mind was largely occupied at this time—in the early part of 1873—with congressional scandals. Chief among these was the Credit Mobilier affair. During the presidential canvass of the preceding autumn, a dispute and lawsuit among some of the Union Pacific managers brought out incidentally a charge that Oakes Ames, a leading spirit in the company, and a member of Congress from Massachusetts, had presented a number of prominent congressmen with extremely valuable stock, for the purpose of influencing their votes. The implicated congressmen hastened to give sweeping denials. The matter was brought up at the opening of Congress; a committee of investigation was appointed, with Judge Poland, of Vermont, at its head, and a thorough inquiry was made, upon which the attention of the country was fixed. Briefly, it appeared that the Credit Mobilier was a company organized to do the actual work of construction of the Union Pacific Railroad, and thus to enable the managers of the enterprise to absorb and divide in profits on the contracts all the subsidy of the government in excess of the real cost of a hasty and cheap building of the road. The Credit Mobilier was, in short, the first, greatest, and most scandalous of the "construction companies" which have since debauched and made bankrupt so many American railroad enterprises; designed to secure the meat of the project to its constructers, even in the act of building, and to leave the shell to be operated as a common carrier, weighted down by an inflated capitalization and an indebtedness of which a foreclosure was the usual result.

The Union Pacific and the Credit Mobilier were controlled by the same men, who in behalf of the former gave contracts to the latter which were enormously profitable, so that its stock for a little time paid fabulous dividends. Oakes Ames, a Massachusetts capitalist, of brains, energy, and of high reputation in his private capacity, one of the early projectors of the Union Pacific, was a member of the House, and was keen to look after the interests of his road, which were liable to be closely affected by congressional action in various forms. He was intrusted by his associates with the disposal of a considerable amount of Credit Mobilier stock, which he was to dispose of, according to a phrase in one of his letters which became classic, "where it will produce most good to us." "We want more friends in this Congress," he said in another letter. Regarded by his fellow-members as high authority upon investments, he recommended to them the Credit Mobilier stock. Several of them took ten, twenty, or thirty shares. He let them have it at par, and in several cases took no compensation, telling the purchasers that the soon-expected dividends could be applied in payment. This was about the beginning of 1868. The dividends proved to be great enough to pay within less than a year the original price, with the addition of a heavy profit. In other words, Mr. Ames gave his fellow-members an investment on such favorable terms that it was equivalent to making them a handsome present. There was no evidence that any suggestion was made of legislative aid in return. The Union Pacific and its Siamese twin the Credit Mobilier needed friends in Congress; members who were getting heavy dividends from its stock would naturally be its friends; give them a little stock under the form of a sale; — that was Ames's view of the transaction, and he probably saw nothing discreditable in it. It is only fair

to presume that the purchasers did not suppose that they were receiving a bribe. But most of them soon grew suspicious of their purchase; the Credit Mobilier was in litigation, rumors of corruption were in the air, and with a few exceptions the purchasers returned their stock within the year, canceled the whole transaction, and made no money out of it. Among those who did this were Mr. Dawes and Senator Wilson. Several others kept the stock and the profits. The report of the House committee imputed no ill conduct or intent to any of the purchasers. But it found Ames guilty of selling shares to members for much less than their true value, with intent to influence their votes and decisions, and recommended his expulsion from the House. It also recommended the expulsion of James Brooks, of New York, for obtaining stock to which he had no right, through his position as government director of the road. But the House, doubtful of its moral right to expel for acts committed by members in a preceding House, substituted a vote of "absolute condemnation," which was passed by majorities of five to one. Both Ames and Brooks died within a few months, of diseases which were undoubtedly aggravated by mental distress.

Other reputations were blasted. In the first panic of the accusation, amid the heats of a closing presidential campaign, several of the implicated members had made absolute denial, not only of wrong-doing but of ever having any connection whatever with the stock. Some of these maintained their denials during the following investigation. As to some of them, the public remained more or less in doubt; against others the evidence was morally fatal. Senator Patterson, of New Hampshire, was by a Senate committee found guilty of falsehood, and his expulsion advised. He escaped only through the expiration of his term. Schuyler Colfax was generally

believed to have spoken falsely in his denial, and the belief was shared even by his old friend of the *Republican*. As to General Garfield, there was a conflict of testimony; there was a memorandum of $329 paid by Ames to Garfield, which the former asserted to have been a payment of profits on a purchase of Credit Mobilier stock, while Garfield declared that the money was a loan which he afterward repaid, and absolutely denied having had any transactions in the stock, in support of which he produced a good deal of circumstantial evidence. The public in general accepted his denial. No very severe condemnation fell upon those congressmen who admitted their purchase of Credit Mobilier stock. It was felt that even those who kept the stock erred through obtuseness rather than intention; that they were conscious only of making a lucky investment. But the very obtuseness, which in a measure was their excuse, showed the need of that sharp admonition which the inquiry and the attendant scandal inflicted. The disclosure of Ames's motive showed how such transactions must be hereafter regarded. The men who were politically killed by the investigation, apart from Brooks and Ames, were punished not for corruption but for falsehood. The *Republican* said, February 21:

"The net in which these unhappy victims are now struggling was woven by their own hands; those minute, harmless-looking filaments of falsehood that fluttered from the stump last summer have done the business for them. After the first lie there was no escape for them. A more impressive homily was never preached."

The whole affair made a painful impression as evidence of a coarse materialism among public men. This impression was heightened when Congress, toward the close of the session, voted to raise the salary of congressmen, and made this provision retroactive, so as to include the

expiring terms of its own members. The "back-pay grab," as it was called, was not a party measure, but, as generally happens, the public dissatisfaction found its chief vent in votes at the next opportunity against the party in power.

The leading question of public policy at this time was that of the currency. Since the great issue of paper money to meet the necessities of the war, gold had maintained a varying premium. In other words, the ordinary money of the country was of constantly fluctuating value, and always below the normal standard of the civilized world. The general remedy, as all intelligent men knew, lay in a return by government to the payment of specie for its notes; though by what special method this should be made practicable was matter of dispute among the experts. But on the part of the ignorant and the demagogues, there was a cry for precisely the opposite course,—that the government should issue more paper money. The best illustration of the worthlessness of the party organizations was that upon this, the most important question before the people, neither party had a policy,—each was divided between a "hard money" and a "soft money" wing. The resumptionists were strong in the East, and the inflationists in the West, while the South took little interest in any question except that of its domestic affairs. The Republican party had a greater proportion of resumptionists than its rival. But among the Republican leaders there were none more prominent than Morton, Logan, and Butler, all of whom were inflationists. The Eastern Democrats generally favored resumption. The subject was the leading topic in the Congress which met in December, 1873. With a Republican majority in both Houses it decided in favor of inflation. A bill was passed in April which was intended to increase the volume of the national currency. It was

circuitous and clumsy in its provisions. But it was, in the *Republican's* words, "the first pure and simple inflation, in principle and purpose, that the country has authorized since the war." All parties regarded the measure as an accomplished fact; for no one at that time had regarded the President as skilled in finance; and, while some of his friends were prominent inflationists, the influence upon his mind of other friends, who were financially conservative, had not been appreciated. But the occasion called out one of those flashes of practical sagacity of which he was capable. Of all the surprises Grant gave the country, and they were many, the most gratifying since the war was his message vetoing the inflation bill. Its plain, terse language matched the solid sense of its contents. Said the *Republican*, April 23:

"President Grant, in vetoing the Finance bill, has taken a step which will be remembered as one of the great and good things of his administration. The settlement of the Alabama difficulty is the only event to be compared with it. The Geneva arbitration and the preservation of the public credit will stand together as the great achievements of his administration. History can never excuse the mistakes and the humiliations of these eight years, but they will grow dim to posterity. The awakening moral sense and the natural recuperative energy of our people will at length purge the resultant diseases from the body politic and they will no longer be a part of us. Peace and public credit, on the other hand, are permanent habiliments of our national character, which we can never lay aside, except to resume again at the earliest possible moment. Whatever is done in their name abides."

Administrative reform was making no progress at Washington. In April, 1873, Mr. Curtis resigned his position on the Civil Service Commission, recognizing that its occupation, if it had ever had any, was gone. Two years later the idle machinery was abolished by

the President. In December the Boston *Advertiser* said, "No department of the public service is in a satisfactory condition, and, worst of all, there seems to be an indisposition to work for a reformation."

The eccentricity of the President's appointments was illustrated in the most important office within his gift,—the chief-justiceship of the United States. As the successor to Judge Chase, at the end of 1873, he nominated his Attorney-general, George R. Williams, of Oregon, who was recommended for the place neither by capacity, attainments, nor character. So strong an opposition was shown to his confirmation, that at his own request his name was withdrawn by the President. He next nominated Caleb Cushing, whose adherence to the Union cause after the breaking out of the war had won for him a kind of amnesty for his former course, and whose recent services at the Geneva arbitration had given him an honorable prominence. His ability and learning were unquestioned, but the old anti-slavery sentiment and the higher conscience of the nation were shocked by his nomination for the most august position in the government. An excuse was found for the retraction of the nomination, in the appearance of an old letter from Cushing to Jefferson Davis in March, 1861,—which however only showed what was always notorious, his sympathy with the Southern cause up to the attack on Sumter. The deeper reason against his appointment was expressed by the *Republican*: "His reputation is that of a man who has never allowed principle or conscience to stand in the way of gain." "He is not an immoral but rather an unmoral man; he has not become demoralized, he never was moralized." The President's third choice was Morrison R. Waite, of Ohio, whom the Senate and the country were glad to accept after such possibilities as had been shown.

The Forty-third House was like its predecessor under the speakership of Mr. Blaine. The leadership on the floor was divided between Garfield and Dawes, under whose influence there was some cutting down of expenses, against the strenuous efforts of the Administration's special supporters. The most prominent figure was Butler, active for inflation, for free expenditure, and for most persons and practices that were under suspicion. The business of this session was largely that of investigations into administrative corruption. Though the offenders were of the same political household as the congressional majority, yet the exposures were made thoroughly, and remedial legislation was applied with good effect. Very weak spots were found in the Treasury Department, and notably in connection with the New York Custom-house, where the system of giving a moiety of penalties to informers had bred a pestilent ring. The government of the District of Columbia was found to be very rotten, and when by way of reform it was transferred to three commissioners, Grant appointed as one of them the man most implicated in the previous scandals, —"Boss Shepherd,"— a nomination which the Senate emphatically rejected. In the Cabinet, as the consequence of the investigations, a weak Secretary of the Treasury was replaced by a strong one, Mr. Richardson giving way to Benjamin F. Bristow, of Kentucky.

In the elections of 1873 the Republicans had shown a great loss of strength compared with the previous year. Relieved from the fear of a Southern restoration under Greeley, the people expressed their growing dissatisfaction with the general conduct of national affairs. In the autumn of 1874 the dissatisfaction rose higher. It was probably increased by the financial revulsion and its sequences. There had come in September, 1873, a great crash. Jay Cooke & Co., of Philadelphia, the promoters

of the great Northern Pacific Railway enterprise, failed; the next day, September 19, Fisk & Hatch, of New York, suspended payment, and then came a grand tumble of commercial houses. Many weeks of frequent failures occurred, and then set in a long period of depression. Its force was still fully experienced in the autumn of 1874, and such reverses generally have an effect against the party in power. There were more legitimate causes for a political revolution. Chief among them were the corruptions disclosed in the two preceding years. The November elections showed a veritable revolution. For the first time since their triumph in 1858 the Republicans' hold upon the national House was broken. They passed from a majority of a hundred into a minority of forty. New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio were Democratic states. Massachusetts chose a Democratic governor, and half of its new congressmen were of the same party. In South Carolina the Republican majority had fallen in two years from 33,000 to 11,000; in Kansas, from 32,000 to 13,000; and so the tide went, the country over. The people which had rejected a Democracy allied and led by Greeley, Sumner, Schurz, and Trumbull, now gave most of its local offices and one branch of its general government to the Democracy pure and simple.

There still remained to the Republicans the closing session of the Forty-third Congress, and an eventful period it proved. The chronic Louisiana trouble broke out with fresh aggravations. In the previous September, most of the Federal troops having been withdrawn from the State, spontaneously and without violence the Kellogg government was dropped by the people, and McEnery and his Conservative associates, who for two years had claimed to be the legitimate officials, were installed in power. The President promptly put troops

at Kellogg's disposal, and upon their appearance the sudden and bloodless revolution was as suddenly and peaceably reversed. A New Orleans committee of seventy presented a formal complaint to the American people. The *Republican* called it the story of "the violated state." Other Liberals, however, and among them Mr. Schurz, maintained that the President had now no option but to maintain the Kellogg government, whose original bad title had been confirmed by possession. As to the low character of that government, and of the Federal officials connected with it, there was no room for question. Two years of its administration had sent down Louisiana bonds from 70 or 80 to 25, and New Orleans City bonds from 80 or 90 to 30 and 40. There was an organization known as the White League, whose object was claimed by its members to be the legitimate protection of the public interest, while its opponents accused it of systematic terrorism of the blacks. There was occasionally an outbreak of violence in which the negroes suffered, and this produced a strong impression at the North, where there was an extreme difficulty in learning the real facts as to the entire Southern situation. The canvass preceding the Louisiana election this year was generally peaceful, and the result was at first understood to be a Conservative victory in the legislature,— the election of governor being still two years distant. But there had been established a Returning-board, intrusted with an extraordinary power of throwing out of the final count the returns from districts where intimidation was shown to have tainted the election,— one of the most elastic and dangerous powers ever given by law. The statute required the presence on the Board of representatives of all parties, but the Conservative member now resigned, declaring he would have no part in the dishonest manipulation which was going

on. After working over the returns for a month, the Board threw out a number of districts, unseated several Democrats, and as to five members referred the question to the House itself. That body met, and in a tumultuous session organized itself in a hasty and somewhat irregular fashion, elected a Democratic speaker, and awarded the five seats to the Democratic claimants. If this action was illegitimate, Governor Kellogg's proper resource would have been to refuse to recognize the House thus constituted. But he resorted to swifter procedure. The Federal troops had been placed at his service, and by his order General De Trobriand entered the House with a file of soldiers and forcibly ejected the five Democratic members. The House was then organized by the Republicans. General Sheridan was dispatched in haste to New Orleans. His telegraphic dispatch to Washington was in full support of Kellogg's action, and denounced the White Leaguers as deserving the treatment of outlaws. Secretary Belknap, in answer, assured him of the entire approval of the Administration.

But a higher power than the Administration was to be heard in the matter. The settlement of local disputes by the employment of Federal soldiery had passed the limit of the people's patience. In the North as well as in the South, the indignation at this last interference was general and deep. It rose higher than party lines. New York spoke in Cooper Institute, by such voices as Bryant, Evarts, and George T. Curtis. Boston responded in Faneuil Hall. The *Republican* hardly exaggerated the feeling of the hour in saying:

"April 20, 1653, Oliver Cromwell drove the representatives of the English people out of their chamber at the point of the bayonet. January 4, 1875, Ulysses Grant repeats the experiment, upon a smaller scale, to be sure,— by sending a file of soldiers into the Senate House of an American commonwealth,

on a like illegal, revolutionary, treasonable errand. . . . Suppose that General Butler, defeated in a popular vote for governor of Massachusetts, had claimed the office under a strained construction of a doubtful statute, and the President had supported him by force and arms, and sent his soldiery to eject members from the State-house? If this sort of thing is lawful and right in Louisiana, it is lawful and right in Massachusetts."

The Administration found it had taken an untenable position. The President sent a message to Congress, January 13, rehearsing the recent history of Louisiana, ably defending his own course until the interference of De Trobriand's soldiers,—but at that point suspending judgment, and virtually referring the whole subject to Congress. For this retreat, the gossip of the time gave credit to the influence of Secretaries Fish, Bristow, and Jewell, and such congressmen as Carpenter, Edmunds, Hoar, and Boutwell,—a different class from the President's habitual advisers. A House committee took the imbroglio in hand; a sub-committee—Charles Foster, William W. Phelps, and Clarkson N. Potter; two Republicans and a Democrat—went to New Orleans, and brought back a report strongly condemnatory of the Returning-board and the entire Kellogg government. They testified not only to the unsound tenure and bad administration of the governor, but that the election had been generally peaceful and fair, and that the Returning-board had grossly abused its power, throwing out many parishes without a shadow of excuse. The report made a deep impression. The other Republicans of the committee — G. F. Hoar, Wheeler, and Frye, stronger party men than Phelps and Foster—then went to New Orleans, but failed to find justification for the Returning-board. When the committee reported toward the end of February, they all agreed that the board had "wrongfully applied an erroneous rule of law"; that

Democrats had been cheated out of their seats, and that the Louisiana House should be advised to "repair this great injustice." A majority of the committee — the original sub-committee, together with Mr. Marshall, a Democrat — added the declaration that the preceding canvass had been free from intimidation, the whites having judged it necessary and politic to win the blacks by conciliation. Messrs. Hoar, Wheeler, and Frye recommended that the Kellogg government should be recognized; Marshall and Potter protested against recognition; and Foster and Phelps gave a sort of passive assent to it. Congress had no direct authority in the premises, but its influence was given with decisive effect for the compromise which was proposed to the local parties by Mr. Wheeler. It was settled that the Democrats should have the disputed seats, which gave them a majority in the legislature, and that they on their part should recognize Kellogg and his associates as entitled to their offices. It was but the briefest pacification of the local feuds and troubles, but another two years passed before the Louisiana Returning-board again brought the peace and honor of the nation into peril.

The autumn election had warned the Republican party that it was likely soon to lose the Presidency. By way of response, a vigorous effort was made at Washington to so administer the more unsettled Southern states that their electoral votes should be held for the party. A purpose was generally believed to exist to obtain a third term for President Grant. For whatever reason, the policy of the executive toward the South, which had been marked by a good deal of moderation since Grant's reëlection, was at this time sharply changed. While the Louisiana question was still pending, early in February, the President sent to Congress a message in regard to Arkansas, proposing to set aside as illegal the government

of the state. That government had for years been peaceably and undisputedly exercised by officials whose tenure seemed beyond reasonable question, but who were politically opposed to the senators of the state, Dorsey and Clayton, both of whom belonged to the Grant faction. Said the *Republican:* "The English of this message is: 'Authorize me to make war upon the government and people of Arkansas, in the interest of my third term.'" About the same time a more comprehensive measure regarding the South was brought forward, known as the "Force bill." Its design was to construe every possible form of injury or menace to the blacks as conspiracy against the general government, punishable in the Federal courts; to bring elections under the close supervision and control of the Federal officials; and to give the President large power for the suspension of the habeas corpus. The open appeal in its favor was addressed to the dissatisfaction of the Northern people with the depressed condition of the freedmen; its inner motive was the purpose to control the approaching election. The *Republican's* comment on the bill was:

> "It marks progress by a road which other republics have found pretty dangerous and costly traveling. It sets the man above the law. It is unconstitutional, unrepublican, un-American; utterly repugnant to the traditions and spirit of our political institutions. Its enactment would be a treason to the cause of civil liberty and self-government."

The best sentiment of the dominant party was strong against it. The New York *Times*, the Boston *Advertiser*, and the Chicago *Tribune* — called by the *Republican* the leading Republican newspapers respectively of the country, of New England, and of the West — opposed it as full of peril. In the party caucus called to consider it, Blaine, Poland, Garfield, and Hawley spoke against it.

But the clique which surrounded the President pushed strongly for the policy of force. The key-note was given by the Administration organ in Washington, which repeatedly printed in prominent letters this paragraph: "The passage of the bill is required to preserve to the Republican party the electoral vote of the Southern states." Butler tried to spring the final vote on the House at a time when the opposition had understood that another measure was to be considered, and were unprepared. The Democrats, skillfully led by Randall, "filibustered" and postponed the vote till a day when strength could be fairly measured on it. The Republicans broke their ranks; the "noes" against the bill included forty of their number, among them such members as Garfield, Hawley, Pierce, Poland, the two Hoars, Dawes, Hale, and Kasson. The "ayes" came very largely from men who had failed of reëlection, and had no political future save in the favor of the Administration. But the ayes were a majority. "It is putting the case mildly," said the *Republican*, "to say that it is the worst day's work any party has done for itself since a Democratic majority passed the Kansas-Nebraska bill."

The President's personal influence had been strongly used in behalf of the bill. Mr. Bowles wrote from Washington a few days after:

"We have had no other President in the last generation who could have carried the Southern Force bill, as it was done last week, against the conscience and the intelligence of its great majority."

Said the paper on the day after the passage of the bill:

"It is almost impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of the interests at stake, at this moment, upon the moderation and self-control of the best people at the South, and upon their success in controlling their more ignorant and excitable neigh-

bors. Never has a high-spirited people found itself in a case calling more urgently for the heroic virtues, justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude."

But the vote in the House was the last of the reaction. The Force bill had no chance of success in the Senate, for the deliberative customs of that body made it impossible for Morton and Conkling to push it through against a resolute minority within the few remaining days of the session. The long-debated Civil Rights bill became a law — good in itself, said the *Republican;* better if made part of a general plan of pacification; but with its present accompaniments equivalent only to "civil rights prodded in with bayonets." But in the House the Arkansas bill, championed by Butler and fought by Poland, failed by fifty votes. The brief seeming victory of the force policy was really a defeat. Grant was obstinate, but he was not a fool,— he had heard from the country on that subject, and he accepted the message.

Amid these sectional turmoils, a measure of great importance had been adopted by Congress with very brief debate. The President's message at the opening of the session had discussed intelligently and forcibly the resumption of specie payments. Said the *Republican*, as to this point: "There is to be a positive Administration policy, for the first time since McCulloch went out" (President Johnson's Secretary of the Treasury). Six years, it continues, have educated President Grant up to the importance of the subject, and now in Mr. Bristow he has a capable secretary. A fortnight later, John Sherman, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, presented a bill aiming at resumption, which was approved in a Republican caucus, and laid before the Senate. Its important provisions were that the existing

restriction on the total amount of national bank note circulation should be removed; that United States currency, to the amount of eighty per cent. of whatever new bank notes might be issued, should be withdrawn from circulation, until there was left outstanding only $300,000,000 of currency; that the government should redeem its currency in gold on and after January 1, 1879; and that the Secretary might apply to this purpose any unappropriated balance in the treasury, and might also sell bonds authorized under a previous funding act. In the Senate, the bill was sharply criticised by hard-money Democrats like Bayard and Thurman. Their criticism, and that of Senator Schurz, fell especially on the point that it contained no provision for destroying the retired "greenbacks,"—which might perhaps be re-issued by the Secretary, to the frustration of any such contraction as must precede resumption. After a single day's debate the bill passed the Senate by 32 votes to 14; all the New England senators except Sprague supporting it, and Schurz finally voting for it.

While it awaited action in the House, it was very generally condemned by the leading hard-money newspapers. The New York *Times* favored it, as the best that could be had from the present Congress; but the New York and Chicago *Tribunes*, the Boston *Advertiser*, and the *Financial Chronicle* were severe against it as ineffectual and hardly more than a pretense. The *Republican* summed up against it in a trenchant leader. It urged these objections,—that the contemplated expansion of the bank note circulation was unlikely to come; that even if it came, the entire currency would be increased and not diminished, through the withdrawal of only 80 per cent. of greenbacks; that as to *how* that 80 per cent. was to be withdrawn — with what funds redeemed — the bill was wholly silent; that, even if some

amount were temporarily withdrawn, a secretary might re-issue it at his pleasure. In short, the *Republican* declared the bill to be a sham, with no real object except to give a sop to the resumptionists, and tide the Republican party over the presidential election. Of Sherman's failure to meet Bayard's and Schurz's questions in the debate, it declared: "He preserved concerning all its features the discreet silence of a conspirator for party success against public welfare."

The bill passed by the Senate December 22, 1874, was taken up by the House January 7, when the Louisiana flurry was at its height, and was passed without debate, by 136 to 99. Among the "noes" were New England Republicans like Dawes, Pierce, the Hoar brothers, Hawley, and Willard.

The measure was a compromise, so framed as to obtain a passage in a Congress very doubtfully divided, and it was accepted by most of the resumptionist members largely on the authority of John Sherman. To all criticisms upon it there is one word of answer — it succeeded. The provisions as to free banking and accompanying contraction bore small fruit;— it was the permission to the secretary to use the treasury reserve, and to sell bonds, that promoted the desired result. Just how this came about, and just how much the statute law helped the broader social forces, is a question for the experts. But it is to be noted that the *Republican* misjudged the man and the motive behind the bill. The independent and irresponsible critic is always liable to make too small allowance for the difficulties of practical statesmanship,— for the necessity of compromises, of half-measures, and of keeping a hold of the majority. Especially the *Republican* showed itself sometimes, as in this instance, too suspicious of the leaders of the party organization. It did not always recognize that an excessive regard for party

may be connected with a sincere regard for the country. Sherman was an extreme partisan on sectional questions; but his framing and carrying through of the resumption bill, followed by his administration of it to a successful issue as President Hayes's financial secretary, was an illustration of sagacity, courage, and statesmanship.

The President at the close of the session made a happy stroke by vetoing an extravagant and scandalous bounty bill. His cabinet, too, had been greatly strengthened within a year, in two departments. Marshall Jewell, of Connecticut, as Postmaster-general, had given new vigor and efficiency to the service. He was a thorough business man, and he conducted the post-office business with entire disregard of all partisan claims; "just like a cotton factory," was the disgusted comment of a place-broker. Secretary Bristow, taking a department where the corruptions had been worse, began a more striking reform, and at the same time strongly favored resumption, in which last he had the coöperation of the President. At the beginning of 1874 the *Republican* said:

"If the Republican party wants to recover its health, let it compel all its other official representatives to do what Messrs. Bristow and Jewell are doing, or give place to men who will. These two men have solved the problem. They are not great statesmen; they are not doctrinaires; they are not even professed reformers, in the sense in which that term is generally understood. They are simply men of the world, who have brought to their duties good sense, business habits, a correct theory as what the people want, and a resolution to gratify them to the best of their ability. They have merely shown a disposition and purpose to do their own work, as heads of departments, in a workmanlike way,—honestly, efficiently, economically. . . . Let the Republican party Bristowize and Jewellize itself, and a speedy convalescence is assured."

Three state elections in the autumn of 1875 bore respectively on the three great subjects before the country. In Ohio, the question between resumption and inflation was brought to a decisive test; the New York canvass showed the effect of partisan politics upon administrative reform; and the campaign in Mississippi illustrated how the Southern communities were likely to settle their difficulties.

Early in June the Ohio Republicans nominated for the governorship Ex-Governor Rutherford B. Hayes. A month later the Democrats nominated Governor William Allen, who had been elected two years before by a small majority, and adopted resolutions directly in favor of an inconvertible paper currency. It was their avowed determination to win on this issue a victory in the state which should be the precursor and key-note of the Democratic presidential campaign. This open adoption of a financial heresy was, said the *Republican*, "one of those defeats that mask a victory and lead to a conquest." But the Republican politicians of the state at first avoided this question, fearing to openly oppose a popular sentiment, and based their appeals and discussion on insignificant and local issues. But Murat Halstead in the powerful *Commercial* made direct and vigorous attack on the inflation doctrine. Stewart L. Woodford, coming as a campaign speaker from New York, helped to force the fighting on the same line. Then Schurz took the platform with a strong popular plea for honest money. The party politicians followed the lead which they had been too timid and short-sighted to initiate. On the other side such hard-money Democrats as Thurman — a promising presidential candidate — fell in with the drift of their party, and had no rebuke for Allen when he called for abundant money for the poor man, and denounced the "despotism of the money power." The

Louisville *Courier-Journal*, which had been a hard-money paper, declared that the South would accept any policy as to the currency that seemed necessary to a Democratic victory. The Republicans of other Western states, who had been divided and hesitating, felt the lift of the wave in Ohio. Morton himself, taking part in the Ohio canvass, recanted his financial heresies. The result justified the bolder course,— the Republicans regained the state in October, by about five thousand majority. That result proved to be the decisive defeat of the inflation movement. The resumptionists had still for a time to defend their doctrine and to bring forth its fruit in works,— but, in reality, the serpent which had been scotched by Grant's veto, and again bruised by the Resumption Act, was killed by the Ohio election. The political credit for these three victories accrued legitimately to the Republican party.

In New York the central figure was Samuel J. Tilden, who in 1874 had been elected governor by 40,000 majority over Governor Dix. Mr. Tilden was now in his sixty-second year. He had early engaged in politics, but soon devoted himself mainly to his profession, and for twenty-four years was known chiefly as a lawyer, employed especially in railway litigation, and in that field one of the two or three leading practitioners in the country. Meanwhile he gradually rose to a leading place in the party councils, and as a cool, crafty, long-headed politician proved himself to have no equal in the state or even in the country. He was at the head of the state committee in the years when Tweed was boss of the party in the metropolis; and he tolerated him and accepted the party gains through his rascalities, very much as the other leading politicians of the day tolerated the serviceable rascals in their respective parties. In the general revolt which overthrew Tweed, he was one of

the first to join, and his unwearied application and his acuteness in unraveling the bank accounts of Tweed, Sweeney, Hall, and Connolly, furnished the principal evidence by which the thieves were brought to punishment. On his election as governor, he at once devoted himself to the purification of the state's business, and especially to dislodging a set of plunderers who had intrenched themselves in the management of the canals, and whose political and personal affiliations were so wide as to give them immense power. Through the year 1875 the war of Governor Tilden on the canal thieves, and that of Secretary Bristow on the whisky ring, were watched by the people as the two most conspicuous services to good government. At the autumn election the legislature and the minor state officials were to be chosen. Tilden and his associates had driven the corruptionists out of the control of the Tammany Society, had brought their party to pledge its hearty support to the reforms, and had secured excellent nominations. The Republicans were put on their mettle. At their convention, instead of some satellite of Conkling, George W. Curtis was made president; F. W. Seward was nominated for the chief place — secretary of state; a platform was adopted fit to delight the heart of Liberals,— condemning the third term idea, calling for a "just, generous, and forbearing policy" toward the South, favoring local reform, and even hinting a compliment to the reforming Democratic governor. The virtues of their opponents seemed to have brought about a millennium within the party, with the saints' places given to the lately despised Liberals. During the year, such party papers as the *Times* and the *Commercial Advertiser* had constantly pooh-poohed Governor Tilden as an impostor, and his reforms — which had reduced taxation by nearly three millions — as a humbug. Now it was loudly declared

that for real reform, with protection against the late rebels included, the only party to be trusted was the Republican. But as the canvass proceeded, it speedily appeared that for this occasion the whole brood of canal thieves and their friends were also Republicans. Their salvation lay in defeating Tilden, and for this the only chance was in a Republican victory. In New York City the Republican leaders entered into close alliance with the faction which had been ejected from Tammany. In view of this situation, the *Republican* earnestly maintained that in New York the paramount issue was the approval or condemnation of the one man who had won the bitter opposition of all the thieves. It declared that behind the fair professions and respectable candidates of the Republicans the rascality of the state was mustered to repel its most dangerous assailant. The home question which Tilden asked the people was: "What concern have you by what name a man is called who goes to Albany to misrepresent your interests?" The election showed a divided result. The Democrats had chosen their state officials by a considerably reduced majority, and the Republicans had won the legislature,—a body which proved more solicitous to thwart a Democratic governor than to help his reforms. After the election, the *Republican* renewed its blame of Mr. Curtis and his associates in a sharp controversy with *Harper's Weekly*.

"It is of no use, sir,"—so it said,—"you are arguing against the plain facts. You and your sort of Republicans thought it good politics to help a gang of alarmed and vindictive Democratic corruptionists to their revenge on a reforming governor. That is the record, and there is no getting away from it. How much your party has been benefited by the operation remains to be seen. With that we have nothing to do. The fact that concerns us in the business is that reform has been stabbed in

the house of its friends — that good men, honest men, well-meaning men, have been found ready and eager, for the sake of a mere party advantage, to help the thieves strike down a man entitled on every ground to their warmest sympathy and support. We shall never get at reform in this country until the honest men of both parties are ready to join hands with each other against the rascals of both parties — every time and all the time."

Mississippi had been under the control of a party which filled the governorship with a carpet-bagger from Massachusetts, the lieutenant-governorship with a negro from another state, and many of the local offices with grossly ignorant blacks. The party had among its leaders a few men of high character and ability, but they could not turn the general tide. Over-taxation, inefficiency, and corruption burdened the state. At this election of 1875 the classes which represented most of the property and intelligence of the community made a well-considered and resolute attempt to drive the dominant party from power. To do this it was necessary to alienate a portion of the black vote from the Republicans. Personal influence was used among the blacks in all forms of persuasion, and with some degree of intimidation. The principal weapon seems to have been the bread-and-butter argument: "If you want work from us, you had better vote with us." The mere spectacle of the whites united and determined could not but have some effect on the fears of a weak and servile class. Prudence, if nothing more, deterred the whites from a too open exhibition of force, but there was some degree of violence, and more of menace. Governor Ames, while the canvass was going on, declared that terrorism was being employed which he could not repress, and called on the President for troops. But on that subject the President had lately heard from the country. He replied through Attorney-general Pierre-

pont, that proof was wanting of any exigency grave enough to justify the intervention of the Federal power, the use of which in such cases it seemed best to carefully limit. At the polls the Conservatives gained an overwhelming victory. Some such result was inevitable, sooner or later, throughout the Southern communities. The *Republican* welcomed the result as on the whole a great gain, though blaming some of the means employed.

Congress met in December, 1875. The bugbear with which the Republican orators had scared their constituencies,—a Democratic House with scores of "Confederate brigadiers," among the majority,—had become a reality. The monster did nothing very alarming. The speakership was given to Michael C. Kerr, of Indiana, a man of unblemished character and high ability, a resumptionist, and hampered by no personal pledges. He filled the chairmanship of the three important financial committees with Morrison, of Illinois, Randall, of Pennsylvania, and Cox, of New York. He proved an excellent speaker, but he was under a wasting disease which sapped his strength, and he died at the end of the session in the following summer. "One of the Democracy's ablest and safest leaders," was the *Republican's* judgment—"a cool-headed man of sound judgment, of clear perceptions, and of steady will, wise in counsel and efficient in performance." The suffering of his disease was aggravated toward the end by a false charge of corruption, from which he was completely exonerated, and the House, as one of its last acts, sent a vote of sympathy to the dying speaker. His successor was Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania.

The Democratic majority in the new House showed itself chiefly interested in reducing the expenditures and investigating the corruptions of its opponents. But the attention of Congress and the country was speedily

called to more stirring topics than dry questions of revenue and expenditure. A bill was introduced early in the first session for a universal amnesty at the South. A similar measure had in a previous year received the support of many of the Republicans, including Mr. Blaine. But Mr. Blaine now proposed an amendment, excepting Jefferson Davis from the amnesty, and in a vigorous speech justified that exception on the ground of Davis's responsibility for the cruelties to Northern prisoners in Andersonville and the other Southern prisons. A more effective fire-brand could not have been thrown. The Northern people, in their wrath against the rebellion as an enormous crime, were always inclined to make Davis the special scape-goat; and if there was one word that could kindle the Northern heart to flame, that word was Andersonville. That Davis was responsible for Andersonville was never proved; but to give proof of a matter of fact was unnecessary for Mr. Blaine's brilliant rhetoric. He succeeded in kindling the embers of sectional feeling into a lively blaze. The House resounded with crimination and recrimination; and Mr. Blaine baited hot-blooded Southerners — like Hill, of Georgia — as skillfully as the matadore enrages the bull. The country, as it read the debates, took the matter much less hotly, but enough feeling was aroused at the North to give hopeful promise of another presidential campaign on the old issue, and to bring Mr. Blaine into enviable prominence for the Presidency. He had avoided compromising himself too far with the special friends of Grant, and now that the third-term project was hopeless, its residuary legatees — Morton and Conkling — found themselves suddenly outshone in popular favor by the dashing, adroit, "magnetic" Mr. Blaine.

Congress after a time succeeded in giving attention to more prosaic topics than the war of the rebellion. The

Democrats showed themselves deficient in constructive ability and in definite policy. But they cut down expenses and sharply investigated several departments, to the gain of the country. Department administration was the foremost topic of the season. The cabinet was a house divided against itself. Secretary Bristow had been for a year carrying on a warfare against the most corrupt and extensive ring in the country, a combination among whisky distillers to cheat the government of its revenues from their productions. The ring had ramifications among men high in power and authority. Criminal prosecutions were begun in the leading cities of the West. Bristow showed high courage and energy, and his resources were taxed to the utmost by the difficulties he encountered and the foes he made. The President had at first approved of his plans, and had issued an order containing one of his epigrammatic sayings, "Let no guilty man escape." It was sincerely meant, but Grant could never be convinced that any friend of his was a guilty man. When the prosecutions implicated one and another of his political allies and servants, when at last his secretary and favorite, Babcock, was involved, his attitude became jealous and almost hostile. By several interferences he distinctly hindered and discouraged the prosecutions. Ex-Senator Henderson, one of the leading counsel for the government at St. Louis, was discharged in the middle of a suit, for remarks which seemed to reflect on the President. An effort was made by the President to have Babcock's case brought under the friendlier jurisdiction of a military court. It was plain to every one that Bristow had neither the hearty support nor the liking of his chief. Babcock was acquitted, but though it was clear that his associations ill befitted a President's confidant, he was restored to his place and favor at the White House.

Meantime, Mr. Delano had been succeeded in the Interior Department by "Zack" Chandler, whom the *Republican* — September 22, 1875 — thus measured: "Very rich, very coarse, very fond of pleasure, a thorough materialist in fiber and life, a very Grantish selection." Personally honest, he is a partisan and a machinist; "he hasn't a reforming hair in his head. He will be an accession to the anti-reform faction in the cabinet." In fact, Secretary Chandler used his office mainly as a basis from which to conduct the operations of the Republican national committee. Among Grant's rapidly changing secretaries, Mr. Fish remained a fixture in the state office, to the advantage of the country, and Mr. Robeson in the Navy Department, not so advantageously. A House committee investigated that department without finding proof of dishonesty in its chief, but declared that of the two hundred millions he had spent, sixty millions had been squandered outright, while the navy was in a worse condition than when he took it. Early in March a special friend of Grant in the cabinet — General Belknap, Secretary of War — was suddenly revealed as a bribe-taker. He had appointed to an army sutlership a man who sold the place for twelve thousand dollars a year and paid half of this to Belknap. The guilty secretary at once offered his resignation; it was accepted; and upon his subsequent impeachment by the House the Senate acquitted him on the sole ground that his resignation had taken him out of its jurisdiction. This open bribery in so high a place came to the public mind as a sort of culmination of a long series of corruptions and disgraces. The *Republican* said that it had brought the people "under conviction," and into an extremely sober state of mind.

As the presidential conventions approached, there was within the Republican party a strong and growing

desire for a nomination which should be above reproach or suspicion. This sentiment to a great degree crystallized into a support of Bristow. With this the *Republican* was in fullest sympathy. Its summing up of Bristow's character, when the contest was over, was this:

"He has shown a quality of good and faithful service unique in our government annals. There have been greater Secretaries of the Treasury,—men of more genius, of broader culture, of riper acquirements, of more brilliant parts. But none of them all ever planned and executed such a campaign against public thieves; none of them all made himself so hated and dreaded by the whole fraternity of rascaldom. If the pluck and constancy of the secretary in that campaign, his readiness to take personal risks in their cause, his fortitude under discouragements and reverses, the bull-dog tenacity of his grip, endeared him to the people,—the rare discretion and modesty with which he has worn his laurels have endeared him to them still more. Honorably ambitious, not unconscious of his deserts, he has not allowed his ambition to become a fever in the blood, he has resolutely refused to put himself forward, he has gone quietly on in the discharge of every-day, humdrum duty."

Mr. Bristow had not been identified with the independent wing of the Republicans, and among his supporters in the press were reckoned such Republican journals as the New York *Times*, Boston *Transcript*, Worcester *Spy*, Hartford *Courant*, New Haven *Journal*, Norwich *Bulletin*, Chicago *Tribune*, Cincinnati *Gazette*, and Cleveland *Herald*. Against him, said the *Republican*, at the opening of the convention, June 15th, were "the machine," the whisky rings of the West, and such railroad magnates as Tom Scott and Jay Gould. "This last influence," it added, "has been more subtly pervasive and potent than the plain voters dream of. The reform leaders themselves probably underrate it. If Mr. Blaine

should get the nomination, it would be the direct gift of Tom Scott, through his Pennsylvania political attorneys and agents."

In April an invitation to a conference at New York was sent out to a number of prominent men of both parties, signed by William C. Bryant, President Woolsey, Alexander H. Bullock, Horace White, and Carl Schurz. The conference met at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, with an attendance of one hundred and fifty, including such men as Bryant, Schurz, Peter Cooper, Dorman B. Eaton, Edwin L. Godkin, and Dr. Holland from New York; Mark Hopkins, Alexander H. Bullock, Julius H. Seelye, Charles F. Adams, Jr., Francis A. Walker, Henry L. Pierce, and T. W. Higginson from Massachusetts; President Woolsey and David A. Wells from Connecticut. The sentiment generally expressed was that parties were instruments and not ends, and that the two great rival organizations were to be judged according to the men they should nominate in the coming canvass. No third party was proposed, but a committee was appointed with authority to re-assemble the conference should it seem necessary at a later time. An address written by Mr. Schurz was adopted. It declared that while the settlements of the war are to be guarded, yet, "We must as American citizens recognize it as our most pressing duty to reëstablish the moral character of our government, and to elevate the tone of our political life." The partisan civil service system was pronounced the chief source of mischief. No man, said the address, is worthy of support for the Presidency, who is known only for virtue of the passive kind, or as to whom the question may fairly be asked whether he will be a thorough-going reformer. Names were not publicly discussed, but the sentiment of the gathering was clearly understood to be that the Republicans ought to nominate Bristow, and the Democrats

Tilden. Of this conference Mr. Bowles was one of the active promoters, though not himself a member.

Party gatherings at this season heard talk of an unwonted kind. In the New York Republican convention, a majority of two to one were in favor of Conkling, but the minority were so strong that no attempt was made to give binding instructions to the delegates to the national convention. Mr. Curtis made a memorable speech. He began:

"Plain words are best. . . . The corruptions of the Administration, exposed in every direction, culminating at last in the self-confessed bribery of the Republican Secretary of War, the low tone of political honor, of political morality, that has prevailed in official Republican service, the unceasing disposition of the officers and agents of the Administration of this country to prostitute the party organizations relentlessly and at all costs to personal ends, have everywhere aroused the apprehension of the friends of the government, and have startled and alarmed the honest masses of the Republican party."

Meanwhile the interest which the national House persisted in taking in financial and railroad matters assumed a direction not personally agreeable to Mr. Blaine. Very definite reports were in circulation that in 1871, during Mr. Blaine's speakership, several railroad companies, including the Union Pacific, had bought from him certain securities of the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad Company, at a price greatly in advance of their market value,—in other words, that they had made him a gift which wore the color of a bribe. Mr. Blaine met the charge in the House with a sweeping denial. The charge was renewed, and the House referred the subject to a committee. From the complicated statements made before the committee — not to speak of further disclosures in 1884 — a few salient points must suffice in this place.

That the Union Pacific paid $64,000 for a lot of bonds worth much less, was not disputed; but the president of the company, Thomas A. Scott, testified that the bonds were bought of him as remuneration for his services. It was at the time believed by some who were near the transaction that Mr. Blaine was the real seller of the bonds, but of this there was no conclusive evidence. The inquiry brought other matters to light. Mr. Blaine had owned a large interest in the bonds of the Little Rock and Fort Smith. In his first statement to the House, he declared: "I bought some of these bonds, not a very large amount, paying for them at precisely the same rate that others paid"; and again, "I never had one except at the regular market price." But the inquiry brought out these facts: Mr. Blaine had a private agreement with agents of the company, in accordance with which he induced certain friends of his in Maine to invest in it $130,000 in cash; for which they received $130,000 of first-mortgage bonds, an equal amount of preferred stock, and an equal amount also of common stock; while for negotiating this purchase Mr. Blaine was privately to receive from the company $130,000 of land-grant bonds,— which, according to current prices at the time, the Maine purchasers would have received along with their other bonds and stock — and as an additional bonus he was to have $32,500 of first-mortgage bonds. In effect, Mr. Blaine did actually receive the greater part of his stipulated commission,— about $95,000 in bonds. The company speedily got into difficulties; Mr. Blaine's friends found their promising investment turning out a very bad one; and he took back the securities they had bought and returned their money. How he disposed of these securities was a mystery he never disclosed, and it was some of these that he was suspected of getting the Union Pacific to buy at a fictitious value. This, however, was

not made out. But what was made out beyond a peradventure was that Mr. Blaine — in his anxiety to cover up the fact that in the sale to his Maine friends he was secretly acting as a heavily-paid broker for the road, and receiving a commission at the purchasers' expense — publicly stated and reiterated that he got none of the bonds except by paying for them just what others paid; while really he got $95,000 of them as a secret commission.

Certain other statements in his testimony it is scarcely possible to interpret as truthful. On one circumstance he put a bold face. When asking the managers of the Fort Smith and Little Rock for a partnership in their speculative projects, he urged that at a previous time, while in the speaker's chair, their interests being imperiled by a measure before the House, he had privately suggested to one of their friends to make a point of order which would defeat the obnoxious clause; the point was made accordingly, the speaker sustained it, and the clause was thrown out. In this action at the time there was no impropriety; but when Mr. Blaine, being still speaker, urged this official action as ground for a substantial favor from a railroad company whose interests were liable again to come before the House,— and when he and his friends refused afterward to recognize any impropriety in his making such a claim,— there seemed something less than an ideal standard of official honor.

The culmination of the inquiry was dramatic. Mr. Blaine's dealings in the Fort Smith and Little Rock transaction had been principally with Mr. Warren Fisher of Boston. Mr. Fisher's confidential clerk, Mr. James Mulligan, a man of unimpeached veracity, was called before the committee as a witness. He testified that one of the executive committee of the Union Pacific told him that the $64,000 of bonds which that company bought

came from Mr. Blaine. In the midst of Mulligan's evidence, Mr. Blaine whispered to a friend on the committee a request for an adjournment till next day. The adjournment was moved and carried. That evening Mr. Blaine visited Mr. Mulligan, who held a number of Blaine's letters to Fisher. Blaine exhausted his eloquence to get these letters into his own hands. Said Mr. Blaine before the committee next day: "I said, 'Why, you are not afraid of my keeping them, are you?' and he said 'No,' and handed them to me." Mr. Blaine looked them over, handed them back, and then asked that they be given to him,— in the most imploring terms, as Mulligan testified, and with the offer of a consulship; but Mr. Blaine testified that the talk about a consulship was a joke. Finally, on the understanding that they were to be immediately handed back, the letters were again placed in Mr. Blaine's hands — and have staid there ever since. Mulligan laid the facts before the committee, next day; and Blaine's defense was that Mulligan had said that if his testimony was impugned he should publish the letters in self-defense; and this, as they concerned his private affairs, Mr. Blaine would not submit to; with the defense also that the letters did not belong to Mulligan any way. He declined to give the letters to the committee. The effect of this maneuver was very unfavorable to Mr. Blaine throughout the country, and a chilling frost fell upon his budding prospects for the nomination. Four days later, June 5, Mr. Blaine rose in the House, made one of his most effective speeches, "took forty-four millions of his countrymen into his confidence," and read a portion of the letters with a running explanation — sufficiently plausible to keep him afloat for eight years longer. Five days later, on Saturday, Mr. Blaine asked and obtained an adjournment of the committee until Monday. On Sunday he

fell down on the church steps, and the news of his alarming illness was telegraphed all over the country. On Monday the committee, on account of this illness, dismissed the witnesses for two weeks. On Tuesday Mr. Blaine sent a cheering telegram to his friends in the convention.

The convention, which met at Cincinnati in the middle of June, showed plainly, as had been foreseen, that the people had had enough of the Administration clique. The President's known partiality for Conkling hardly brought him a vote outside of New York. All that state's delegation were in his favor except Mr. Curtis. Pennsylvania was nominally for Hartranft, and finally divided between Blaine and Hayes. Morton had a considerable support from the Southern delegates, and with good reason. He had been the most strenuous and perhaps the sincerest supporter of the coercive policy. Blaine's strength was greatest in the West. Bristow's support was not unequally scattered among the different sections, but was greatest in Kentucky and Massachusetts.

The *Republican's* correspondent described the convention as not a body of high character. The reform element was in a small minority, but made itself felt and respected. The convention listened civilly to Mr. Curtis, who presented a very plain-spoken address from the New York reformers. But the tumultuous cheering came when Colonel Ingersoll launched the name of James G. Blaine, and pictured him as a chivalrous hero, his "white plume" leading the charging hosts like Henry of Navarre. The delegates who composed the charging hosts had been elected before the Mulligan episode, and did not flinch from the field for a trifle like that. On the first ballot, Blaine had 285 votes, Morton 124, Bristow 113, Conkling 99, and Hayes 61. Blaine's strength ran up to 351 on the seventh ballot, but the union of all the opposition

gave 384 votes, and the nomination, to Hayes, who had scarcely been thought of in advance, save as he might get a courtesy vote from his own state. "The result," said the *Republican*, "is in the nature of a compromise, but still a reform victory. The true representative battle in the party convention was between Bristow and Blaine, but in order to beat Blaine his opponents had to lower their standard and unite on Hayes. Mr. Bristow's friends led off in the sacrifice, Morton's followed, and the rest came tumbling after." For Vice-President, William A. Wheeler, of New York, was nominated.

The value of the result as a reform victory appeared at first to be very uncertain, and chiefly apparent in the fact that neither Blaine, Morton, nor Conkling had been nominated. The resolutions were in the old tone; the new national committee was of the old stripe. Governor Hayes was little known to the country at large. His letter of acceptance was looked for with unusual interest. In the interval came the Democratic convention at St. Louis, at the end of June. Governor Tilden was in the unique position of a prominent representative of administrative reform, and at the same time the most skillful manipulator of party wires. The opposition to him was from the section of the party in New York and elsewhere which had done much to sink it in popular estimation. For once, virtue and policy seemed in full accord when the party conclave met. The first ballot showed Tilden with three times the strength of his leading competitor, Hendricks, of Indiana. On the second ballot he easily won the two-thirds majority traditionally requisite for a Democratic nomination. The sacrifice to expediency, without which no party convention would be complete, was not wanting on this occasion. The leading rival for the nomination was placated with the vice-presidency, though he was the representative of the

inflationists, to whom Tilden was wholly opposed; and the resolutions, good in the main, while favoring resumption in the abstract, called for the repeal of the single law which held the nation committed to it. But the general spirit of the convention was encouraging to reformers. It was in a marked degree controlled by the young and progressive blood of the party, North and South; by men represented in the one section by Watterson, and in the other by Dorsheimer, of New York, an old Republican and Greeley Liberal. The *Republican's* comment on the general result was: "The Democrats have nominated their Bristow. More and better than that, they have nominated him in the teeth of a desperate opposition from the constituent parts of the thing to be reformed, *because* he is their Bristow, and from a controlling sense of the attractiveness of that sort of candidate this year as a party investment." It recognized weak spots in the platform, yet "as a whole it is permeated and saturated with a sense of the popular demand for reform, and the necessity of catering to it." Still, continued the *Republican*, Mr. Hayes will be a formidable rival among the better class. "He is a very clean man. He got his nomination in a very clean way. He has the better constituency behind him, at the opening of the canvass. The great body of the independent and reforming Republicans have accepted his candidacy — if not with enthusiasm, at least with comfort and gratitude."

While these events were going on, Mr. Blaine had so far recovered his health as to make a speech a week after his attack; then he had a relapse which obliged him to go home to Augusta. When the investigating committee met he was absent, and they adjourned again. Meantime, Senator Morrill, of Maine, was appointed Secretary of the Treasury, and Governor Connor appointed Mr.

Blaine to succeed him in the Senate,— an appointment which he accepted, and telegraphed his resignation to the House. His friends assured the committee that either his presence at a further investigation, or its continuance during his absence, would endanger his health and life. So the inquiry was postponed; when Congress re-assembled, Senator Blaine was out of the House's jurisdiction; and the investigation was never re-opened until taken up by the people in committee of the whole in 1884.

The reformers, well pleased with both the nominations, found their cup of good fortune full when Hayes's long-delayed letter appeared in the middle of July. It discarded the familiar topics and threadbare treatment of partisan literature, and went straight to the heart of the situation, as viewed from the statesman's stand-point. It discussed as the foremost topic the reform of the civil service system. It declared in favor of "the old rule, the true rule, that honesty, capacity, and fidelity constitute the only real qualification for office." It clearly and tersely traced the growth of the system of partisan appointments and pronounced:

"The reform should be thorough, radical, and complete. We should return to the principles and practices of the founders of the government, supplying by legislation where needed that which was formerly established by custom. They neither expected nor desired from the public officer any partisan service. They meant that public officers should owe their whole service to the government and the people. They meant that the officer should be secure in his tenure as long as his personal character remained untarnished, and the performance of his duties satisfactory. If elected, I shall conduct the administration of government upon these principles, and all constitutional powers vested in the executive will be employed to establish this reform."

That there might be no suspicion of the use of presidential patronage to secure a reëlection, Mr. Hayes declared his inexorable purpose not to be a candidate for a second term. As to the South, he outlined in brief words a policy of justice and pacification, and promised an equal care for blacks and whites. The whole letter, said the *Republican*, is "as good an independent reform platform as anybody has written." From the resolutions of the convention to this letter, the step is one "from an atmosphere of narrow unscrupulous partisanship to an atmosphere of broad, patriotic, national statesmanship." Mr. Wheeler's letter was of a similar tone. Mr. Tilden's acceptance was mainly an elaborate arraignment of the Republican party for its corruptions, and a long discussion of financial and administrative reform; less popular in style than Mr. Hayes's letter, less comprehensive in treatment and warm in tone; the production of a sagacious, hard-headed man of affairs.

The morning after Tilden's nomination, the *Republican's* column of brief paragraphs began: "Now let's go fishing!" More than ever after Hayes's letter, with two such candidates before the country, the reformers seemed for once in the position toward their opponents of the man who plays: "Heads, I win; tails, you lose." Never did the prospect seem better at the opening of the canvass for a result which in any case must prove safe and honorable to the country. But a strange chapter was impending — of vicissitudes, perils, mischiefs, and escapes.

CHAPTER XLIII.

Massachusetts Politics.

THE political history of Massachusetts in the years 1873-76, while not in itself a very important chapter in the world's affairs, is too illustrative of the condition of parties and of public opinion to be passed by without notice. It was a time and field in which the independent voter was being developed into a political power, and here was done some of Mr. Bowles's most characteristic work.

At the beginning of this period, the Credit Mobilier scandal destroyed some high reputations, and shadowed others. The *Republican* pronounced Mr. Dawes fully acquitted. It said of him, after the congressional investigation, early in 1873: "He is the same Mr. Dawes whom the people have delighted to honor. He has not thrown away his crown, he still stands for what is best in American character, tendencies, and aspirations." In the ensuing election of a successor to Senator Wilson, early in 1873, it preferred him to Mr. Boutwell,— his successful rival,— as a man of more independence and leadership. The same year saw Butler's perennial quest of the governorship renewed. It differed from that of previous years mainly in the active support now given to Butler by Grant's Administration. He was again beaten by Governor Washburn in the convention.

The resolutions of that body spoke strongly against the abuses of the times. But at the end of a long session, the reforming element negligently allowed their opponents to choose a very unreformed State Central Committee, including Simmons, one of Butler's most serviceable lieutenants. Butler was in the convention, and thrust upon his opponents a sharp test of their political orthodoxy, by introducing a resolution declaring a certain member of the convention not entitled to his seat, because he had said in private that he would not support Butler if he received the nomination. The question involved was a very awkward one for the good party men who make up the bulk of a convention. The anti-Butler leaders did their best to get rid of the resolution without discussing the principle which it involved, of the binding force of a nomination upon the members of the nominating body. Only one man faced the real question. James Freeman Clarke declared:

"Every man, every member of the Republican party, has a right first of all to his conscience. Every man has a right to say, 'I will not vote for a man whom I believe to be a dangerous man to his country.' . . . I came here to give my honest vote, according to my own convictions or the convictions of those I represent; and when that vote is cast, and I return to my town, then I have a right to decide, as any other independent man decides, whether I shall vote for the nominee."

Mr. Clarke was one of the "idealists" in politics who seek something more than a temporary victory. It might satisfy the professional politicians to defeat Butler, but he looked beyond that, and in asserting the "divine right of bolting" struck at the root of the deeper evil — the tyranny of party.

The *Republican* spoke well of the Democratic candidate, Mr. Gaston, but declared that reform through the Democ-

racy was hopeless. It heartily supported Governor Washburn for reëlection. His majority fell off from the previous year by sixty thousand. Butler's disaffection, the support of Gaston by the liquor interest, and popular impatience with the Administration, contributed to the result. That impatience was heightened when, a few months later, the President promoted Butler's friend Simmons to the Collectorship of Boston. His confirmation was hotly opposed; both the state senators and seven of the eleven congressmen worked against it; but the President's influence prevailed with the compliant Senate. Simmons was a characteristic product of the times. He was a man of good private life, a church-goer, a Methodist class-leader, but a practiced adept in manipulating the lowest class of voters, and in carrying elections by dubious means.

A few days later Charles Sumner died. For the vacant chair in the Senate, the east and west of the state offered each a candidate — Judge Hoar and Mr. Dawes. The *Republican* at the outset gave preference to Mr. Dawes. It said that Judge Hoar, though acute and courageous, was of a less statesmanlike temperament, and too strong an adherent of President Grant. As worthier than either candidate to succeed Sumner, it named Charles Francis Adams. A new aspect was given to the contest by the active participation of Butler, doing his utmost in favor of his old opponent Mr. Dawes. This support the *Republican* treated as dangerous and discreditable, and urged Mr. Dawes to repudiate it — but urged in vain. It was a characteristic stroke of Butler, to thus thrust himself in as the unsought ally of an old opponent; — as if reckoning that Dawes was a less unrelenting enemy than Hoar, and might be partially disarmed by service thus rendered. When for a fortnight Mr. Dawes had silently allowed himself to occupy the position of Butler's

candidate, the paper said, that while he was above suspicion of bargaining for this support, yet, "whether consciously or unconsciously, he has been grinding in Butler's mill, and the fact will probably lose him the senatorship, as it ought to." There was another week of balloting and then the two sides suddenly compromised by the choice of Governor Washburn. The paper's comment was:

"Mr. Dawes has only Mr. Dawes and General Butler to thank for the fact that he is sitting to-day in the House and not in the Senate. But for these two gentlemen he should have been, could have been, and would have been, the successor of Charles Sumner. . . . A mistaken sense of dignity shut Mr. Dawes's lips. He has not sold out to Butler, he has not soiled his honor, or pocketed his principles, or turned his back on his record. But he has made a grave political mistake, he has grieved his real friends, he has pleased his enemies, and he has allowed his candidacy to be used at a critical moment to confuse the minds of the people of Massachusetts upon an issue of tremendous importance. . . . Rightly appreciated and utilized, the mistake may exert a most beneficent influence upon his future."

In the following summer Mr. Dawes declined a reëlection to the House, and it was understood that he would be a candidate for the full term in the Senate at the expiration of Senator Washburn's year of service. The *Republican*, when his retirement was announced, said that while he had made mistakes, while he had repeatedly failed to rise to the height of an occasion, yet, "the people of no congressional district in the Union have been more ably, faithfully, and satisfactorily represented than his western Massachusetts constituency."

Who should fill the chair that Mr. Dawes had occupied for eighteen years? The Democrats knew well that their only chance for the succession lay in going beyond the

ranks of the party's old file-leaders for a candidate. They fixed on Chester W. Chapin, president of the Boston and Albany Railroad, a man highly esteemed for business sagacity and success, and of irreproachable character, who had taken little active part in politics, and had not sought the nomination. In accepting it, he wrote that while he had been a life-long Democrat, he held that present public questions called for an independent judgment and unpartisan treatment. The *Republican* said of him:

"For many years past Mr. Chapin has been the most massive and conspicuous figure in western Massachusetts. No other living man in this section of the commonwealth so largely represents its material prosperity and development. No contemporary has had so great and direct a hand in the crowding of its streams with mills and making bustling cities of quiet villages. He stands for our local wealth and importance as no other man does or can. Whether elected to Congress or not, he will remain as he is to-day, our representative citizen."

This is a somewhat idealized sketch of one whose long career left little other impression than that of a man extremely skillful in handling material forces by legitimate means for his own enrichment. Yet it was just to say of him that he was a conspicuous and trustworthy representative of the business element of the community.

Among the opposite party a disinclination to the office was shown by some men who stood high in the community's estimation. Early in September the *Republican* expressed its preference for Mr. Gillett for the Republican nomination, if he would accept it, or, failing that, for Mr. Soule. It referred to Henry Alexander, Jr., Mr. Bowles's brother-in-law; said that he was a skillful politician, a master of the machine, who had been successfully cultivating popularity; who, without statesmanship or much "fanaticism of principle,"

would make a safe and uncommonly efficient working congressman. As the canvass proceeded, it became evident that all the professional politicians of the party, and all the local "bosses," big and small, were working for Alexander. As this fact developed, the *Republican's* opposition to him became pronounced. It said: "It is the misfortune of this candidacy — to put the fact in the most delicate way — that it is backed by men, interests, ambitions, combinations, and methods which ought never to be allowed to make a Massachusetts congressman." When, a few days later, the convention met, it was expected by some that Mr. Alexander would receive the compliment of a nomination, and would decline it. This was the belief of Mr. Bowles, who had continued on good personal terms with Mr. Alexander, and had told him in private what the paper had publicly intimated,— that it would oppose him if nominated. Mr. Alexander was present at the convention, was nominated, and accepted. The *Republican*, which, after Mr. Chapin's nomination, had awaited the action of the other party, declared in his favor against Mr. Alexander. Its words were:

"The voters who are at once sincere and intelligent in their aroused preference for clean politics have no alternative but to accept the issue thus forced upon them. They do not need to be told that behind Mr. Alexander are the worst men, the worst practices, and the worst tendencies of our local politics. He appears in the canvass as the candidate of the professionals, the traders, the vote-mongers, the rings, the jobs. As such, he ought to be defeated."

The paper opposed him during the brief canvass which followed, actively and strenuously, but without a word of imputation on his character beyond his political maneuvers and affiliations.

This contest in the twelfth district was not an isolated one. Throughout Massachusetts the question of the

supremacy of the Republican machine* was being tried more openly and strenuously than it ever was before or since. Part of that machine was in the worst hands, and the decent men who handled the rest of it had not the courage to disown their disreputable allies. Butler was a candidate for reëlection to Congress. In another district the Republican candidate was Dr. Ayer, known only as a wealthy patent medicine maker, whose friends were reported as spending money like water in his behalf. In the Hampshire and Franklin district the managers had quietly fixed on a candidate of their own,— a man personally unobjectionable,— and proceeded to arrange the caucuses in his interest. But there were men in the

* The "Machine" is an illustration of the mixture of necessary and mischievous elements in politics. The word signifies an unofficial but efficient combination of men, for controlling the action of the nominating conventions. Usually, the basis of the machine is found in some of the numerous series of committees — national, state, district, town, and ward — appointed to manage the business of the party. It is the legitimate work of these committees to provide for the orderly holding of the primary meetings — or caucuses, as they are called in New England — and the delegate conventions; and also to manage the canvass after the nominations are made. But the members of these committees have also great facilities for controlling the nominations, and it is in this direction that their legitimate power often runs into usurpation. Under our system of party government the work of electing public servants is half accomplished when the nominations have been made, for the voter is then shut up to one of the two sets of candidates. The control of the nominations is of course a chief aim of the selfishly or honorably ambitious, and the familiar resource for that end is a combination of active managers, usually in the party committees. Such a combination may be employed to advance good men and promote the public service, or for wholly personal and selfish ends. Without some preconcert, some consultation and preparation in advance, a nominating convention could hardly do its work intelligently. Thus, while the Machine is generally so named as a reproach, it may serve a perfectly legitimate end; may act as one cog-wheel in the complicated system by which out of ten million individual wills there is sifted an agreement as to who shall administer the government. But, because it is largely a secret power, and not directly responsible to public opinion, the Machine is peculiarly liable to unworthy use, and even at its best needs the counter-check of an independent and vigilant public sentiment.

party who believed that a better candidate could be had, and even without fighting the wire-pullers on their own ground. Some fifty Republicans, substantial citizens, came together at Greenfield, and proposed to the voters of the district to send to Congress Prof. Julius H. Seelye,— a scholar and a man of acknowledged character and ability. The conference appointed a committee, who in their published address declared that the caucus system had become an instrument by which a few men ruled the people, and it was time for the people, in their own behalf, to choose the best and ablest man who could be found. The party convention was duly held and ground out the expected grist. The volunteer opposition made a vigorous fight. Meantime, the best sentiment of the whole state was in revolt against the abuses which the national Administration had tolerated. A different sentiment and interest too was aroused against the Republican candidate for governor. The last legislature had superseded the prohibition policy by passing a license law. Governor Talbot, chosen lieutenant-governor the year before, and successor to Governor Washburn upon his election to the Senate, vetoed the bill. This action offended the anti-prohibition sentiment, which had grown very strong in the state. But Talbot was nominated for another term by the Republican convention of 1874, in which the prohibitionists constituted the only aggressive, courageous element; the rest being, in the *Republican's* words, "a confused huddle of respectabilities, timidities, conservatisms, and negations." For the present campaign, said the paper, Republicanism has been made synonymous with prohibitionism. "The election of Mr. Talbot is the triumph of extremists, and means the continued sham enforcement of an impossible law, to the great injury of public morals; the election of Mr. Gaston is a lurch toward the other extreme, whither

the friends of temperance as distinguished from prohibition and free rum have even less disposition to go." The paper, however, leaned rather to the support of Mr. Gaston.

Back of all these local questions, lay the issue to which the whole country was aroused,—the general tendencies of Grant's administration and the congressional majority. Toward all the broader and higher aspects of the election, the orthodox party leaders showed a singular blindness or timidity. Mr. Dawes in his speeches had nothing but unqualified laudation for the Republican party,—no eyes for anything wrong at the South except the old rebel spirit,—no recognition of any misuse of patronage by the Administration, or any bad tendencies in the party organization. In his zeal for Republicanism, of whatever sort, he spoke for the party and all its candidates in the district where Butler was seeking reëlection.

The campaign of 1874 was in Massachusetts a battle royal between the Machine and the People. Election day proved a Waterloo for the Machine. Gaston was chosen governor over Washburn,—and the election of the rest of the Republican state ticket emphasized the popular independence of party lines. The legislature chosen was opposed to prohibition, and favorable to the "local option" principle, which has ever since been maintained by the state. Butler's district gave a thousand majority for his Democratic opponent, Charles P. Thompson. Four other Democratic congressmen were chosen. Ayer was defeated. Banks was sent to Congress as an Independent. Professor Seelye was elected by five hundred plurality over his Republican competitor. The twelfth district, which as to the governorship was Republican by three thousand majority, elected Chapin by fifty-five hundred majority over Alexander. In its entire results,

the election was for the *Republican* a full retrieval of the political defeat of 1872. To its incessant gospel of independence this was the most emphatic response ever made by the state.

The choice of a senator to succeed Mr. Washburn devolved on a Republican legislature. The leading rivals were again Mr. Dawes and Judge Hoar, and the *Republican* again gave the preference to Mr. Dawes, as between the two, but urged the Democrats to put forward the elder Charles Francis Adams, who might possibly draw enough votes from the other side to win the election. The Democrats made the attempt, but only as an eleventh-hour resort, after first supporting Judge Abbott; and Mr. Dawes was chosen. The close of his service in the House — where among a group of able party leaders he had taken more nearly than any other man the foremost place — was honorably marked: he skillfully carried through a bill for tariff reduction, and he was one of the party minority who voted against the Force bill and in effect prevented it from becoming a law.

The state campaign of 1875 was spiritless. The fluctuating state of parties was curiously shown by the fact that in the Republican convention Mr. Adams received half as many votes for governor as the successful candidate, Alexander H. Rice, of Boston. The *Republican* called the resolutions presented by Mr. Dawes "a smart piece of special party pleading"; and said the convention represented no advance, no uplift, while it offered a respectable candidate. Its presiding officer was Henry Wilson,—one of his last public appearances, his death occurring in the following November. His office as Vice-President had given him no influence with the Administration, and his efforts for a broader and better policy had produced little visible result. The Democrats renominated Governor Gaston, and associated with him

General Bartlett for lieutenant-governor. General Bartlett declined the nomination, and the *Republican* applauded him for doing so: "He is not the man to be a neutral, and it is simply because the campaign, as made up now in this state, is practically a neutral one, that he declines to go to the front." The paper gave its preference, on the whole, to the Republican ticket. Last year, it said, there had been a local reason in Gaston's favor—the repeal of the prohibitory law, and the abolition of a worthless constabulary designed for its enforcement. There had been also a broader reason, in the necessity of rebuking the then dominant tendencies at Washington; and there had been some hope also that Gaston might prove an aggressive reformer. That hope was disappointed by his administration; the substitution of local option for prohibition had ended that question; and as Massachusetts was naturally a Republican state, Rice would have stronger forces urging him forward than Gaston. At the election Rice was chosen by about five thousand plurality.

The first half of 1876 witnessed a serious and earnest effort for the elevation of the Republican party of the country. One instance of it in Massachusetts was a conference of reform Republicans at Worcester, early in April. Among the signers of its address to the people were James R. Lowell, James F. Clarke, John D. Long, Charles Allen, Edward Atkinson, Alexander H. Bullock, and, from Springfield, Charles O. Chapin, Marcus P. Knowlton, and N. A. Leonard. The key-note of the address was, "Do not leave the caucuses in the hands of those who make politics a business." The party convention, three weeks later, to choose delegates to the presidential convention, was full of the reform spirit. It sent as delegates-at-large E. Rockwood Hoar, Richard H. Dana, John M. Forbes, and Paul A. Chadborne—all supposed to favor Bristow; and

of the other delegates from the state — who included George F. Hoar, Richard M. Dana, Henry L. Pierce, James F. Clarke, and James R. Lowell — a majority were Bristow men. The delegation came short of its expected unity and weight at Cincinnati, apparently through some latent friendliness to Blaine; but, on the whole, among the preliminary forces of the canvass Massachusetts counted heavily on the side of reform. The autumnal canvass saw much of the old story retold,— the heat of a presidential campaign banishing the non-partisan temper, and putting the extreme party men to the front. At the convention in September Senator Boutwell presided, and was fierce against the South. Governor Rice was renominated; Butler, a supporter of Boutwell for the impending senatorial election, came again to the fore, was loudly applauded, and was put up — on the state central committee. The next day the Democrats met in convention. The perennial favorite of the *Republican* had been taken up by the Democrats of western Massachusetts; the idea spread to the east, and Mr. Gaston, withdrawing his own name from the contest, proposed Charles Francis Adams for governor. There was unanimous approval, and the *Republican* cried, "Sense and statesmanship at last!"

The congressional elections had some interesting features. Butler secured the party nomination in his district, but Judge Hoar took the field as an independent candidate, and of the Boston papers only the *Traveller* gave Butler its support. Hoar, Clarke, Pierce, and Gordon took the stump against him. The situation in the Springfield district was not altogether agreeable for the *Republican*. It supported Chester W. Chapin for reëlection. Mr. Chapin had made a good working congressman; had served on the important Ways and Means committee; his votes had always been for a

sound currency and against all jobbery; and he had generally been on the same side with such an independent Republican as Henry L. Pierce. But his standing at home had been hurt by a railroad transaction. He was the head of the Boston and Albany Corporation; he had also a controlling interest in the Ware River Railroad, and this last had been leased as a branch to its big neighbor on terms which proved much more profitable to its stockholders than to those of the Boston and Albany. In the making of this lease Mr. Chapin was "on both sides of the bargain,"—a position which the *Republican* was in the habit of declaring that no man ought to occupy. But, without fully justifying Mr. Chapin, it urged that the terms of the lease seemed not unfair at the time it was made, and only an unforeseen course of events had made its working inequitable; and it took a much more favorable view of Mr. Chapin's course than did the legislative committee of investigation or the general public. It could scarcely be acquitted of a friendly partiality which did not accord with its professions or its habitual practice.

The Republicans nominated George D. Robinson for Congress. The paper's objections to him were that he was the favorite of the machine managers, and that he was deficient in the reforming temper. It said, however:

"He has shown in both houses of the legislature a marked fitness for legislative duties, and in the Senate particularly last winter he took perhaps the leading position both in debate and influence in all important matters. A careful and methodical and industrious person, he has many excellent qualities for the details of public service; and with experience would make something more than the average member of Congress. A prudent, cautious man, with good New England principles and habits, he is never likely to compromise himself with obvious wrong-doing; nor is he, on the other hand, ever likely to take

any risks in moving in advance of public or party sentiment. His name will never be found among the list of martyrs to any reform — not if he knows himself, and we think he does."

The tide of party feeling swelled high among Massachusetts Republicans in this campaign. Reformers and half-friends were lightly esteemed. The fight for the Union and the slave was still a fresh memory. The great passions of the early time still answered to the party war-cry. In piping times of peace it might be necessary to discipline the party's bad children; but now, with the enemy in front, better any Republican than any Democrat! Election day showed the state in the old place; — the Republicans swept everything. Hayes had 40,000 majority over Tilden. State officers, congressmen, all went the same way. Adams fared little better than the rest of his ticket; Butler had a clear majority over both his opponents; Robinson beat Chapin by 2000 votes. The combination which Mr. Bowles's paper supported,— Hayes for President, Adams for governor,— found favor with only about a thousand voters. The state was Republican, and ultra-Republican. Yet within two months its pulse cooled. The prize of the senatorship did not fall again to Mr. Boutwell. It went to George F. Hoar,— a man of higher culture and broader views, whose extreme partisanship was intermittent, while that of Mr. Boutwell was chronic. Sobered by the grave exigency of a disputed Presidency, the state preferred its statesmen to its zealots. The story of that disputed Presidency is now to be told.

CHAPTER XLIV.

Hayes and Tilden.

MR. HAYES and Mr. Tilden had hardly been nominated, and written their respective letters of acceptance, when the canvass was directed to issues entirely different from those which the two candidates had discussed. Both of them equally had recognized that the main questions before the country were such as related to administration and business. But the contest between their followers reverted at once to the sectional hostility between North and South. It was the Republican managers who made this diversion. They raised the cry that the freedmen were abused and intimidated, that their vote was to be suppressed, and that the election of Tilden would mean the restoration of the old rebel element. The party newspapers and speakers, with the exception of a few like Carl Schurz, hardly alluded to the topics of civil-service reform and Southern reconciliation which Mr. Hayes had made prominent. One instance among many of their general tone was a speech by Mr. Wheeler, the candidate for Vice-President, in which he said that through Tilden the old South was trying to control the government, and declared: "No such proposition for audacity has its parallel in the history of the country. . . . We confront the old issue. Let your ballots protect the work so effectually

done by your bayonets at Gettysburg, and on many a field of strife."

At the South the canvass was generally a peaceful one. To this there were some conspicuous exceptions in South Carolina. A company of negro militia, peacefully parading at Hamburg, were assailed by a white mob, and a number of them were shamefully massacred. In several places Republican meetings were frightened into dispersal by an aggressive display of force. The governor was Daniel H. Chamberlain, a Massachusetts man, the ablest and best of the Republican leaders in the state, who were for the most part a set of knaves. His administration had been an immense improvement on the misgovernment of his predecessors; so good in fact that the Democrats had seriously considered whether to permit his reëlection unopposed. But his Northern birth and his doubtful affiliations were against him, and they nominated as his opponent General Wade Hampton, a good representative of the old South Carolinians, and a personal favorite with all classes. They bent their energies to carrying the state, and resorted to the double influence of intimidation and conciliation. At Governor Chamberlain's request the President sent a thousand troops into the state and kept them there while the canvass lasted. Throughout the rest of the South, little violence was reported. In Louisiana there was a conspicuous effort to win the blacks by conciliation. The Democratic candidate for governor, Nicholls, was a man of high character and general popularity, while his competitor, Packard, was one of the faction who had misgoverned the state and manipulated its election returns.

While the Northern Republican leaders were denouncing a candidate whose strongest support lay in the South, a various and violent attack was made on Mr.

Tilden's private character. He was charged with corruption in his railroad practice, with evading his taxes, with complicity with Tweed. Meantime, while the theory of civil-service reform was ignored by the Republican managers, its practice was conspicuously discarded. After the Republican convention, the friends of Bristow in the departments were proscribed, and Secretary Jewell was driven to resignation. The Secretary of the Interior, Zachariah Chandler, was the active manager of the Republican canvass. Assessments were freely levied on government clerks. For those who hold that the abuse of the civil service can be checked by forbidding the reëlection of a President, it is a fact deserving note that the partisan employment of the service under Grant was never more flagrant than at this time when there was no possibility of his obtaining another reëlection.

The Democrats were thus forced upon a defensive campaign. But the tactics of the Republican managers, while very effective upon the firm adherents of their party, were by no means winning to that smaller class of independent and thoughtful men whose adherence to either party would turn the balance of success. Governor Tilden's work as a reform governor spoke for his honesty, ability, and courage, more than all that was said against him could outweigh. A few weeks before the election another alarm was raised,—that a Democratic administration and Congress would recognize immense claims by the South for damages sustained in the war. The Cincinnati *Commercial*, now, like the other independent journals of 1872, a supporter of Hayes, declared: "The main question is whether the voters in the North want to pay the bills of the Southern Confederacy." An emphatic letter from Governor Tilden put an end to this argument. Finally, an assiduous appeal was made to the business interests of the North, on the ground

that a Democratic government would imperil the finances of the country.

This was not a campaign for the Springfield *Republican* to find much comfort in. It was supporting Hayes, while it was opposing most of his other supporters. Its old friends and allies throughout the country were not unequally divided between Hayes and Tilden. The Democrats in their nominations of Adams, Hubbard, and Robinson, for the governorships of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York, showed Tilden's personal influence, which everywhere strengthened the reform element in the party. But Hayes's letter of acceptance, and the better quality of the rank and file of the Republican party at the North, drew many independents and reformers to his support. In the doubtful states of Indiana and Ohio, Schurz and Bristow were speaking on the same side with Blaine and Morton and Kelly. The *Nation*, on the eve of the election, summed up the merits and demerits of the two candidates and the parties behind them, with so even a hand that no preference was clearly discernible.

The *Republican* steadily supported Hayes on the ground of his letter of acceptance and his personal trustworthiness. It earnestly opposed the revival of sectional politics, and called on Mr. Hayes to repudiate the course of his managers. It said, September 27, that Butler in Massachusetts, Wheeler in Vermont, Chandler and Don Cameron at Washington, and other recognized leaders all over the country, were making "a war upon Mr. Hayes's platform, a defiance of his principles, and an attempt to capture and overcome his policy, the whole threatening not only his good name but his success in the canvass. If there is fight in the man now is as good a time as ever to show it." But Mr. Hayes was not a fighter of that sort, and held his peace. The paper

treated all parties with an impartial fairness,— and received its reward in abuse from both sides for being neither one thing nor the other. "The real question," it said, September 15, "seems to be, which candidate can most successfully resist the bad conduct and overcome the bad character of his own party?" It was a position much to its taste to be supporting a Republican for President and a Democrat for governor. Its friendliness to the South did not blind nor silence it when real outrages on the freedmen were to be dealt with. After the Hamburg massacre it said that it was not enough for the local papers and leaders to condemn such barbarity, they must *stop it*, by punishing the offenders, or "their disapproval and regret will pass for just what it is worth. Once for all they cannot understand too distinctly that the vast majority of the voters of the Northern states, Independents and Democrats as well as Republicans, are as little prepared to look on with complacent acquiescence at the oppression and murder of black citizens as at the oppression and robbery of white ones." When troops were sent, under a prudent commander, to keep the peace in South Carolina, it cordially approved. It summed up the merits of the two candidates just before the election: as to the Southern question, which has come to the front, Hayes's presidency would represent to that section the North's good-will, and disposition hereafter to let it alone,— which a Democratic victory won by Southern votes could not express; as to resumption, a Democratic Congress would be less trustworthy than a Republican; as to the civil service, Hayes would be preferable to Tilden with the Democracy behind him.

Election day passed, and the next morning the papers all over the country reported that Tilden was elected. He had about a quarter of a million more votes than Hayes. In the Electoral College, according to the *Re-*

publican's estimate, Tilden would have 202 votes, Hayes 153, and 14 were uncertain — those of South Carolina, Florida, and Oregon. Of the Northern states, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Indiana were for Tilden. The people took the result good-naturedly; the skies did not fall, nor stocks tumble; and the fictitious terrors of a presidential campaign seemed to have ended as speedily and harmlessly as they are wont to do. Another morning came, and found the result still unchanged. Then a sudden uncertainty arose, an agitation and anxiety ran through the community; and with the next morning the country found itself face to face with a peril which it was wholly unexperienced and unprepared to meet — a disputed presidential election. Three states were in doubt — Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida. If any one of the three was for Tilden, he was elected; if all the three were for Hayes, it gave him a majority of a single electoral vote. In South Carolina and Florida the popular vote was so evenly divided that the result could not be immediately known. As to Louisiana, without question Tilden had a majority of from seven to ten thousand of the votes cast. But in all these states it was uncertain how far the returning-boards which were to count these votes might go in overruling and changing the results given by the ballot-boxes. The point of greatest interest was Louisiana. Its returning-board had by law the same elastic powers, and the members of the board were the same, as when the trouble had occurred two years before. It was now asserted that on the ground of intimidation the board was likely to declare the votes of certain districts vitiated, and throw them out of the count — enough, possibly, to change the state's vote from Tilden to Hayes. The course of things at New Orleans was now watched with intense interest. From all sides rose a cry for fair play. Leading politicians of both

parties hastened to the scene of action; among them were Sherman, Garfield, Edmunds, Kelly, Kasson, Dix, and Matthews from the Republicans; and from the Democrats, Trumbull, Morrison, Randall, Watterson, and Lamar. Newspapers sent their ablest correspondents. There was a momentary hope that from so many honest men there would come an agreement as to the facts and rights of the case. But there came instead the most conflicting reports. One point only was soon evident beyond doubt — that the result as declared by the returning-board would give the vote of the state to Hayes. Beyond that, the visitors were divided, and by a pretty strict party line, as to what had been, and what ought to be. On one side it was declared that proof was ample of wide intimidation of voters, enforced by murder and outrage, that many of the negroes had been so frightened as not to vote, and that the rejection by the board of returns from such districts was according to the letter of the law and the spirit of justice. On the other side it was said that the evidence of outrages was manufactured, that the election had been fair and peaceable, and that the board's contemplated action was a deliberate perversion of the voice of the state. Before such a contradiction of testimony the country stood perplexed.

Back of the Louisiana dispute loomed instantly another danger. The settlement of that dispute lay ultimately with Congress. It was certain that the Republican Senate and the Democratic House would take opposite sides as to which candidate was entitled to the Louisiana vote; and for such a disagreement between the Houses no provision had been made. It was an inexcusable, a fatal neglect. Senator Morton had for two years done his best to get a law enacted, providing for this very contingency, on the principle that no state's electoral vote

should be counted except with the assent of both Houses. This had been substantially the practice at previous elections since the war, by virtue of a rule jointly adopted by the two Houses, which had now gone out of force. When Congress met in the first week of December, in the *Republican's* words, "it took fire like tow." The Republicans at once set up the claim that, in default of other provision, the question as to which of the conflicting returns was to be counted was to be decided by the president of the Senate. The very slender ground for this claim was in the words of the Constitution: "The president of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted." The Democrats maintained that the concurrence of the House of Representatives with the Senate was essential, and that failing this, there was no choice by the people,— in which case the election of a President would devolve on the House.

The returning-boards of the three disputed states had now given their award to the Hayes electors; in Florida and South Carolina they had come into collision with the state Supreme Courts; and in each of the three states the Tilden electors had assumed that they were chosen,— with more or less countenance from state officials,— and had formally cast their electoral votes; as the Hayes electors had also done. Two questions were before the country,— a question of equity, and a question of procedure. Which candidate was the real and rightful choice of the people? What authority was to pass upon that question, for practical purposes?

At the earlier stage of the difficulty, in face of the original question of what the returning-boards ought to do, the *Republican* had said, November 10:

"It is plainly the duty of the returning-boards of these states to accept the local vote as returned by the local authorities,

without assuming to alter it. It would be the height of folly for the state officials in Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana to attempt to eliminate the factor of fraud and intimidation from the canvass, except in the event of such outrages or wholesale frauds as have been nowhere reported or charged, and as would leave no divided public opinion upon their duty. The resort to these means to carry the election may be safely assumed in the present contest to be about evenly divided. Greatly to be regretted from a moral point of view, it is impossible to subtract them from the result in the arithmetic of the tables after it is done. The glutton who has overeaten at dinner might as well chop off his hand to reduce the surfeit."

The boards had acted on the opposite theory, had made decisive changes in the count, as an offset to alleged intimidation, and public opinion at the North was divided in regard to their action. On the one hand it was widely believed that there had been a suppression of the negro vote throughout the South, and that if there had been a free and fearless election the Republicans would have chosen their candidate beyond dispute. The constant assertion of the Republican orators and newspapers during the campaign had been that the negroes were terrorized. The *Republican* shared this opinion to some extent. It said:

"The legal majority is legally tainted. There is no doubt that they," the Democrats, "have gotten it by varying degrees of fraud and violence, through the influence of fear and interest upon ignorant and corrupt voters. But one wrong does not justify another wrong to correct it. The country has again and again submitted to party victories obtained as unworthily and standing on such disputed moral grounds as this of the Democracy." So long, it continues in substance, as the country clings to a partisan and corrupting civil service, and so long as it has a large percentage of ignorant and vicious voters, so long must it be exposed to political victories immorally won. But a further and more dangerous evil comes in if we meet one form

of wrong by another and higher one, in allowing the count of votes to be tampered with. The next step in this devil's logic will be for the party so counted out to refuse to peacefully submit,—then we shall have come to Mexicanization and anarchy.

But the belief that the negro vote had been kept down by intimidation made the mass of Northern Republicans tolerant for a while of the doubtful practices of the returning-boards. Late in November the *Republican* notes, that of the party papers only the Chicago *Tribune* has protested. But the current of testimony as to fact ran more and more against the boards. It appeared that the total vote in Louisiana had been larger by some thousands on both sides than at the election of 1874, which so good a Republican as Charles Foster, after studying the case on the ground, declared to have been free, peaceable, and full. It was seen that the board had acted illegally, in leaving vacant the place in its membership which the law required to be filled by a Democrat. The details of its action, as they became understood, showed unmistakably a purpose to declare vitiated just enough returns to give the state to Hayes and Packard. The witnesses who testified to outrages before the election proved mostly to be unworthy of credit. The report in which John Sherman and his congressional associates — among whom were Garfield, Kelly, Hale, and Stoughton — vindicated the board, bore on its face the character of a thoroughly partisan document. It was in its whole tone contrary to the report of the Republicans who had investigated this same board's action in 1874. Comparing the two reports, the conclusion was inevitable, that when the Presidency was at stake, the congressional Republicans — or some of them — saw with very different eyes than those which they used when it was only the matter of a state legislature.

All these things began to make their impression on the common mind — the mind of the great people, which means to do justice, whenever it can see its way through the maze of contradictions that wraps every practical question. The party press was no longer unanimous. Early in December, the Boston *Advertiser* — "the most extreme of Republican partisan papers," said the *Republican* — was very gravely questioning the rightfulness of the action of the Louisiana board. In Congress, the passions that at first blazed out so hotly began to cool as intelligent men on both sides realized how serious an emergency they were facing. Each party put its ablest men upon a joint committee of conference,— from the Senate there were for the Republicans, Edwards, Conkling, Morton, and Frelinghuysen; for the Democrats, Thurman, Bayard, and Ransom; from the House the Democrats were Payne, Hewitt, Hunton, and Springer; the Republicans, G. F. Hoar, McCrary, and Willard. The new year found the country sobered and anxious, but not in a mood of panic or passion. Its attitude bore out the words of the *Republican* amid the first alarm and tumult: "The American nation is never so great as when dealing with its own weaknesses and perils."

The conference committee addressed itself to its task, and for three weeks the country awaited its action. Into the general situation several new factors of complication had been introduced. In each of the disputed states there had also been a contest over the election of state officers. In Florida the Democratic governor had finally got an undisputed title to his place. In Louisiana the returning-board had seated Packard. Nicholls set up a rival claim; the legislature split into two bodies; so that two complete state governments were organized side by side. In South Carolina, the Supreme Court, controlled by anti-Chamberlain Republicans, tried to confine the

returning-board to ministerial functions; but the board threw out from the legislature eight Democrats, on the ground of fraud and intimidation; although by the Constitution the legislature was the judge of the election of its own members. The legislature met; the eight Democrats claimed their seats; Governor Chamberlain called for troops; the President sent them; they kept the eight Democrats from entering the House; thereupon all the Democrats withdrew, and organized in a rival body. The district commander, General Ruger, said the troops had exceeded their authority, and withdrew them from the State-house. The two rival legislatures maintained their organizations; and as the legislature had constitutional authority to pass on the returns for governor, one body declared Chamberlain chosen and the other Hampton. Both here and in Louisiana the Democratic legislature soon began to win over members from its rival. In both states, only the presence of United States troops kept the Democratic government from ejecting its opponent and taking full possession. The President would give no recognition or active support to the Republican claimants — the soldiers only kept the peace.

The presidential quarrel was so evenly disputed that both parties recognized that the victor, if seated by legal and peaceful process, would hold his power by too narrow a tenure to pursue any extreme policy toward his opponents. Early in the contest the Republican papers became lavish of assurances that if Hayes were recognized as President he would treat the South liberally — the states might hope to be let alone in their local affairs, and to have their full share of appointments and appropriations. Said the *Republican*, December 29: "This would all have been statesmanship before election; now it is simply truck and dicker."

Before the final action of the state electors, there was great running to and fro of political agents, from Florida to Oregon. At a subsequent time the New York *Tribune* got possession of a lot of cipher telegraphic dispatches, between New York Democrats and their representatives at the South, and gave them to the public in translation. With one exception, they disclosed little beyond the ordinary tactics of the managers of a closely contested canvass. The exception was the proposal to bribe one of the Republican electors in South Carolina or Florida to vote for Tilden. This suggestion came from Mr. W. T. Pelton, a relative of Tilden, and more or less employed and trusted by him and the other party managers. He appears to have engaged in an intrigue, aiming directly at bribery, in which he had the countenance of some men who stood high in the interior management of the Democracy. There was no evidence that Mr. Tilden countenanced the idea, but neither did it appear that Pelton got himself into disgrace with him by it. While the disclosures did not compromise him personally, they showed that some men with whom he was in close alliance were unscrupulous. The unfavorable impression on the public mind was the stronger because Mr. Tilden's great ability was of the kind that is tinged with craftiness. If at this crisis he had discarded artifice, and made his appeal straight and plain to the people's sense of justice,— though the immediate result might perhaps have been the same,— he would have gained a hold on the country. His dealing with the situation was that of a lawyer who believes in the justice of his case, who will not pack the jury or bribe the judge, but who relies largely on an adroit use of the forms of legal procedure. It was evident that the final opposition to his claim was to rest on the profession of respect for state rights. The Republicans showed themselves less and less inclined to discuss

the fairness of the returning-boards' action; but they had become very zealous that Congress should not presume to go behind the official certificate of the governor of a state. The point necessary to get a judgment based on the actual facts was to induce Congress to go back of this certificate, and inquire what had really been the vote of the state. Accordingly there was set on foot in Oregon — and by instigation from New York — a maneuver designed to force Congress in self-consistency to do what it might not do on higher grounds. Oregon had undoubtedly given the Hayes electors a majority of about 1200. But it appeared that one of these electors was legally disqualified to act, because he held the Federal office of postmaster. The effect of such a disqualification was a doubtful point in law. But Governor Grover, a Democrat, took the more than doubtful course of declaring that this elector being non-eligible the candidate who came next him in number of votes was chosen,— in other words, that Democratic electoral candidate who happened to receive the most votes,— a man named Cronin. To him and to the two other Republican electors, the governor gave his certificate. The two Republicans refused to act with Cronin, but chose a man to fill the vacancy, and these three cast their votes for Hayes. Cronin, on the other hand, assumed that the two Republicans had vacated their places; himself named another man to fill the place of one, then the two appointed a third; and of the board thus constituted, Cronin voted for Tilden and the two others for Hayes. This vote was sent to Washington under the governor's certificate, while the three Hayes votes of the rival board had the certificate of the secretary of state — a Republican. This whole proceeding was on its face an attempt to get by a trick an electoral vote for Tilden, which would give him the Presidency even with the doubtful states all counted

against him. But it was soon recognized that the object really sought was not so much a vote from Oregon as a strategic advantage. It put Congress in a dilemma. If that body said, "The governor's certificate is final in every case," then Tilden would be elected through the Oregon vote. If, to avoid this, it decided that a governor's certificate could not preclude investigation into the facts on which it was based,— then an inquiry would be opened, which, while it would doubtless give Oregon to Hayes, could scarcely fail to give Louisiana and the Presidency to Tilden.

The country watched and waited anxiously while the conference committee brooded over its problem. The highest issues were at stake. Unless the two Houses could agree, the nation was confronted with a conflict for the Presidency, with no authority competent to settle it, and such a conflict must probably mean civil war. Before such a contingency the country kept its composure wonderfully,—but the danger was unmistakable. When, in the middle of January, the committee with but one dissenting voice proposed a plan of settlement, a deep breath of relief went through the land. The plan was necessarily an arbitration, and the arbitration was so well devised as to offer every hope of impartiality. The bill provided that the doubtful questions were to be referred to a commission, whose decision was to be final unless overruled by both Houses. This commission was to be composed of five senators, five representatives, and five justices of the Supreme Court. The senators and representatives, by tacit understanding, were to be evenly divided between the two parties. The bill named the justices of the first, third, eighth, and ninth circuits,— ostensibly as an even geographical division, really because Justices Clifford and Field were Democrats, and Miller and Strong, Republicans. These four were to

select a fifth from the associate justices; and the expectation was that they would choose David Davis, who belonged to neither party. To the commission thus constituted the bill delegated, upon all cases which should be referred to it, "the same powers, if any, now possessed for that purpose by the two Houses, acting separately or together."

The country at large gave eager welcome to the bill. The *Republican's* comment represented the general voice: "It is constitutional, it is right, and it is sufficient." But to thorough-going partisans, its merit was its condemnation. It was too impartial. Among the newspapers, the New York *Tribune*, *Times*, and *World* opposed it, and so did the Cincinnati *Gazette*. But in its favor were to be counted not only such independent journals as the New York *Herald*,— whose tone during the entire crisis was notably patriotic and fair,— the Boston *Herald*, and the Cincinnati *Commercial*, but such party papers as the Boston *Advertiser* and *Journal* among the Republicans, and the Boston *Post* and Albany *Argus* for the Democrats.

But in Congress there was a battle. It was not for nothing that the members of the two parties had long sat massed on the two sides of their respective chambers, and looked at every measure and listened to every speech with a first thought of getting the better of each other. The opposition to the measure came mainly from Republicans. Their party had held power for so long that to risk giving it up was more than many of them could endure. But the larger minds rose to the occasion. Edmunds, who was considered the father of the bill, opened the Senate debate with a powerful presentation of its advantages. He was followed by Conkling, who brought forward the historical evidence fatal to the claim on which the Republican opponents of the bill

planted themselves — the claim that the president of the Senate was to decide between conflicting returns. Then Morton threw all his weight against the bill. Party feeling in one who had been a "war governor" in earlier days, was too much for his statesmanship and patriotism, and he alone of the conference committee had refused to sign the report. Sherman and Blaine were his allies in fighting the bill. Bayard and Thurman were strong in its support. Dawes moved an amendment forbidding the commission to inquire "whether any elector was chosen by a majority of the votes of his state." "That," said Thurman, "is a dagger-thrust at the heart of the bill." Dawes at last withdrew his amendment and supported the bill. The debate went on for nearly a week, — the last great debate which this generation has witnessed in the Senate, and perhaps the greatest since the anti-slavery days. The final vote was 47 to 17 in favor of the bill. Of the minority the only Democrat was Eaton. In the House the discussion was much briefer. Hoar, McCrary, and Hewitt spoke for the bill; Garfield and Hale against it. It was passed by 191 to 86. Of the majority 158 were Democrats and 33 were Republicans; of the minority 68 were Republicans and 18 were Democrats. Most of the New England Republicans in the House opposed the bill, as did all but Foster from Ohio and almost all from the South. Its strength in the party was greatest in the representatives of New York, among whom Conkling was very influential. The President conveyed his approval of the bill in an admirable message.

Well might the *Republican* say, "A finer achievement of patriotism amid storm and stress has certainly not absorbed the energies of Congress within our time. As before, our new peril has become our new strength, and the capacity of the American people for self-government is again proudly vindicated." Of the double issue at

stake,—justice and order,—the latter was substantially assured. A legal and peaceful arbitrament of the quarrel had been won. Would the arbitrament also be a just one? Would the commission in its action rise as high as Congress had done in creating it? It was the common belief and hope that it would. The commission indeed failed of that even balance in its membership which had been aimed at. On the very day that the Senate passed the bill, the Illinois legislature, almost evenly divided between the two parties, chose David Davis to the United States Senate, by the votes of the Democrats, and Davis therefore was unwilling to take a place on the commission. The four justices agreed on Justice Bradley as his substitute,—so that politically the commission was divided eight to seven. The Republican opponents of the bill did their best to put upon the commission men who had opposed its creation. They kept Conkling out of the place to which he was naturally entitled, and gave places to Morton and Garfield, foes of the whole arbitration. But, in the temper of the hour, the country attached little weight to these circumstances. There was a confident and proud expectation that all the members of the commission would act, not as Republicans or Democrats, but simply as honest men. In the debate upon the bill in the House, Mr. Hoar replied to the suggestion that the commission, if appointed, would not act in a judicial spirit. He said:

"Of the members of our national assembly, wisest and best, selected for the gravest judicial duty ever imposed upon man, under the constraint of this solemn oath, can there be found in all this Sodom, not ten, not one, to obey any other mandate than that of party?" He rejected with special emphasis any such imputation on the Supreme Court justices. "Any partisan inclination on their part," he said, "will, in my judgment, be overweighed a hundred-fold by the bias pressing them to

preserve the dignity, power, and weight of their judicial office, before their countrymen, and before posterity. They will not consent, by a party division, to have themselves or their court go down to posterity as incapable of the judicial function, in the presence of the disturbing elements of partisan desire for power, in regard to the greatest cause ever brought into judgment."

The full commission consisted of Justices Bradley, Miller, Strong, Field, and Clifford; Senators Edmunds, Morton, Frelinghuysen, Bayard, and Thurman; Representatives Hoar, Garfield, Payne, Hunton, and Abbott. The two Houses in joint session took up the electoral certificates in the alphabetical order of the states, and the first disagreement which arose was on the case of Florida, which accordingly went before the commission. The certificate of the Hayes electors was signed by the governor,— the regular legal authority; that of the Tilden electors was certified by the secretary of state. It was known that the returning-board had played fast and loose with the returns, and with the mandates of the Supreme Court: construing its own powers now as ministerial, now as judicial; and finally allowing returns to be thrown out in two precincts where no evidence had been given of any intimidation. There was a further question, whether one of the Hayes electors had made himself eligible by a proper resignation of the Federal office which he held. The question debated before the commission was: May evidence be introduced beyond the formal certificates to show, first, that the board acted illegally in the rejection of returns, and secondly, that one Hayes elector was ineligible? Here was the vital question of the whole matter,— was the commission to consider anything more than the technical correctness of the governors' certificates from the disputed states? This point was battled between the foremost lawyers of the

two parties,— O'Conor, Black, Field, and Tucker on the one side; on the other Evarts, Kasson, McCrary, Stoughton, and Matthews. The one side pleaded equity, and the other law. This is an extraordinary tribunal, said the one,— this is the highest court of the people; its duty is to thoroughly inquire whom the people have chosen for their President; let us have justice,— nothing more, nothing less! Said the other: We are here simply to interpret and declare the law,— the law asks only that the returns be certified by the governors of the states,— any further inquiry is beyond the commission's powers. The Republican position was stated exactly by Stanley Matthews:

"The actual question now before the commission is not which set of electors in Florida received a majority of popular votes, nor which set of electors appears from the return of the votes made at the primary polling places to have had a majority, but which set by the actual declaration of the official authority of the state charged with that duty has been clothed by the forms of law with actual incumbency and possession of the office."

The arguments ended, the commissioners debated for a day or two by themselves, and then voted,— to admit testimony as to the elector's eligibility,— by eight to seven, Bradley voting with the Democrats; to exclude testimony as to whether the board acted illegally,— by eight Republican votes to seven Democratic. The question of the one elector's eligibility was then considered and the substantially unanimous conclusion was in favor of the elector. The decision was reported to the two Houses,— Florida's three votes awarded to Hayes. The Senate by a party vote sustained the decision,— the House objected to it, voting on a party line except for one stray independent Democrat. So the commissioners' decision stood unreversed.

The final result was now clearly foreshadowed. When the case of Louisiana went to the commission, motions were made by Democratic commissioners,— first, that evidence be admitted that the returning-board was an unconstitutional body and its acts void,— rejected by a party vote, eight to seven; next, that evidence be admitted that the board was illegally constituted, in that its members were all of one party,— *No*, eight to seven; then, that evidence be admitted that the board threw out votes dishonestly and fraudulently,— *No*, eight to seven. The governor's seal ends it, said the eight; count Louisiana's vote for Hayes.

The commissioners' verdict went before Congress. The final word rested now with Senate and House. Senators debated from the lawyers' stand-point. Thurman urged: Such an omnipotent returning-board as is here recognized is hostile to the principles of our government. This board did not even fulfill the requirement of the law that created it; it was defective, maimed, void. Morton answered: By the Louisiana law a majority of the board is a quorum; one vacancy no more destroys its competence than one vacancy disqualifies the Senate. When the decisive vote was taken, Conkling staid away,— Blaine staid away — the Senate voted on a party line to accept the commissioners' decision.

Then the House debated it. Two men only broke the party line. Mr. Pierce, Republican member from Massachusetts, said:

"That gross fraud was committed in the canvass of the votes is admitted, I believe, by both parties; and it is also admitted that the returning-board acted in discharge of their duties in an illegal and arbitrary manner. If these are not matters which the representatives of all the people, authorized by the Constitution to count the vote and declare the result, can inquire into — then this government stands on a very insecure foundation."

Mr. Seelye, Independent Republican from Massachusetts, said that he recognized that it might be technically correct for Congress to decline to set aside the decision of the state authorities:

"But there are cases where the *summum jus* becomes the *summa injuria*, cases where the law strictly interpreted and strenuously enforced works a result which contradicts all law; and in such cases equity lays the letter of the law aside, and lifts its voice in judgment as the sovereign spirit of the law, the spirit of righteousness and truth, determines. Precisely such a case seems to come before us in the pending issue. Granted, and this seems beyond dispute, that the Electoral Commission have strictly and accurately applied the Constitution and the laws to the question laid before them; yet what if the very principles on which the Constitution and the laws must ultimately rest become thereby subverted? Granted, that the decision reached is fairly within the bond, yet what if the pound of flesh cannot be taken without its pound of blood? What if this jealous care of the rights and prerogatives of a state should so foster faction, and blunt the sense of justice, and increase the prevalence of fraud, that the very foundations of rights should disappear?"

"It was well," said the *Republican*, "that such a protest should be spoken in behalf of Massachusetts. The conservative influence of the commercial capital, and the rigid morality inculcated by her higher seats of learning, found proper expression in the manly speeches of Henry L. Pierce and Julius H. Seelye. That they but represent the conscience and judgment of the great majority of their constituents, there can be no doubt."

Louisiana was thus registered for Hayes. In the case of South Carolina, the commission unanimously rejected the Tilden votes; and then accepted the Hayes votes by the familiar eight to seven. As to Oregon, they were unanimous in rejecting Cronin's vote; but the seven

held that there was a vacancy through ineligibility, and only two Hayes votes were to be counted; while the eight accepted the three Hayes votes. The ground for setting aside the governor's certificate in this case was that the certificate was valid only so far as based on the action of the canvassing authority provided by the laws of the state — namely, the secretary of state. In the *Republican's* words, "Political burglars in Louisiana put up a job to steal the eight electoral votes from Tilden; a counter-burglary of one Hayes vote was attempted in Oregon. The Electoral Commission decided that there was no way of recovering the stolen goods in the Louisiana case; it has found a way of restoring the Oregon vote to its rightful owner."

While the decisive cases were on trial, the *Republican*, which had been one of the first, perhaps the very first paper in the country to propose a reference to the Supreme Court, recognized that the legal ground for a decision was more uncertain than the question of equity. But as to the commission's powers,—which by the bill were made co-extensive with those of Congress,—it pointed out that Congress itself had on previous occasions rejected state returns on a variety of grounds,—for fraud and miscount, and even for a mere informality — the absence of the state seal. When the decisive pronouncement had been made, it summed up, February 20:

"The Louisiana decision is a shock to the moral sense of the nation. . . . It is not necessary to suppose that the tribunal which has made this decision was either insincere or dishonest in reaching it, but it is impossible to resist the conclusion that partisanship dominated in its deliberations and dictated its conclusions. No legal moralist can examine with any closeness the grounds on which the majority rest their verdict, without feeling that even the law points were painfully strained to reach the desired result."

The passage of the law, it continues, was greeted by the country with a profound sense that justice and patriotism were to triumph over technicalities and partisanship. The attitude of Edmunds and Frelinghuysen and Hoar in the preceding debate had given every hope for their impartial action on the commission. The popular faith was strong that the Republican justices, who held the balance of power on the commission, would set an example of impartiality.

"The very reverse has proved true, and instead of being an example and inspiration to their Republican congressional associates, they have led them back and down. . . . Thus it is at a terrible cost that the country gets a peaceable presidency, since it comes through the worst illustration of the dominance of partisanship that the present generation has seen, and at the expense of the country's respect for and faith in the judges of its highest tribunal. . . . Still it is worth it all, and the acquiescence of the losers, constituting the large majority of the people, in what is felt to be a moral wrong for the sake of peace, is one of the greatest triumphs of the American instinct, principle, and habit in government, ever recorded."

That triumph was not quite assured yet. Many of the Democrats in the House could not reconcile themselves to their disappointment. They determined to resort to tactics of obstruction, — to "filibuster" by dilatory motions and roll-calls, so as to prevent a formal declaration of the result until the session expired, and then to claim that in default of a popular election the House was to elect. But this scheme found little support among the Southern Democrats. Their general attitude was expressed by Henry Watterson, who said in the House:

"If the acceptance of the inevitable with resolution and dignity be the highest as it is the rarest form of courage known among men, it is made the harder in this present instance by

the consciousness of double-dealing and foul play. Two courses are open to the majority on this floor,—on the one hand, passionate outcry, at once impotent and childish; on the other hand, without offering needless obstruction to the progress of events, an earnest, manly, but temperate protest against what they believe is a great wrong. In my judgment, the latter is their clear and bounden duty."

There was sound patriotism in this position, and there was sound policy. The really vital thing to the Southern Democrats was the vindication of legal and local governments. As to these the converging logic of events all tended to one conclusion,—the hand of the Federal government must be lifted from Louisiana and South Carolina. The personal representatives of Mr. Hayes recognized this necessity and expressed it. A Washington dispatch to the *Republican* said, February 26:

"It is because the Southern members of Congress have been made to feel by the direct personal assurance of Mr. Hayes's friends, that he will not continue the Grant policy in the Southern States, that he will withdraw the troops from the support of the carpet-bag governments, and give Hampton in South Carolina and Nicholls in Louisiana an opportunity to prove by experience that they are the rightful representatives and rulers of the States,—it is because the Southern members have been made to thoroughly feel this, that they are sustaining the progress of the count under the electoral bill, unjust as its results are to their claims and beliefs."

But there was a dangerous temper among the Northern Democrats in the House, and a few Southerners. The "filibusters," to the number of about eighty, made their fight in a night session, March 1, trying to stave off a declaration of the result. They were led chiefly by insignificant men, but they made a stormy scene. By a strange turn of the whirligig of time it was the demagogue and "copperhead" of earlier days, Fernando Wood, of New York, who by common consent led the

combined Democratic and Republican opposition to the obstructionists. They were beaten, and at four o'clock on the morning of March 2, Rutherford B. Hayes and William A. Wheeler were declared elected President and Vice-President.

The peaceful acquiescence of the entire people in the result of the arbitration was a notable instance of respect for legal forms and capacity for self-government. But it was deplorable that that acquiescence was not accompanied by a more general protest against the partisanship which controlled the verdict. There was little emphatic rebuke except from the losing party. Two feelings helped to smother disapproval among Republicans,—the gratification at escape from civil discord, and a belief that the Democracy had carried the disputed states only by intimidation. A singular instance of the prevailing intolerance is given by the *Nation* in its review of the history of its first twenty years. That paper, if any in the country, might be supposed to have a constituency trained to respect a sturdy independence of editorial opinion. Yet it records that "for refusing to believe that Mr. Hayes could honorably accept the Presidency at the hands of the Louisiana and Florida returning-boards," it lost nearly three thousand subscribers. So much for the perils of independent journalism,—so much for the strength of party passion among intelligent men.

"Look forward and not back," said the *Republican*. "If the world could be frozen into still life till November, 1880, and begin then where it leaves off now, the Democrats would sweep the country, on the ground of the wrong they have suffered. But nothing of the kind will happen. We live, and time goes on, and each year as it becomes the present does much to obliterate the past. Some sure result there is from what has happened. The Democratic party after its acquiescence can no longer be identified with the rebel line at Gettysburg, or the Kuklux masqueraders. But the party has its own future to make. . . .

Human wrongs get righted somehow, but the cycle of vengeance rarely completes itself in accordance with constitutional periods and human calculations, and more frequently never vindicates justice to human eyes at all. The Democrats must not rely on their past wrongs as their future capital. For the Republicans, this event makes a break with the past; it will probably be the end of the policy and the men that have led up to this consummation. It gives to the new administration an opportunity and a summons. It must go on, and increase, if at all, by going. Old wounds must be suffered to heal by being let alone. Vindication must be sought in new questions and new issues."

The curtain rings down on one act,— the curtain rings up on another. Exit, the electoral dispute,— enter, the Hayes Administration. And what kind of an administration will that be? The new President announces his cabinet,— Evarts in the State Department, Schurz in the Interior, Devens as Attorney-general,— all these belonging to the liberal wing of the party, and one of them the foremost of the reformers. John Sherman has the Treasury,— a partisan as against the South, but the Southern question is virtually closed; a partisan too as to the civil service, which is a great question of the future ; but the author of the resumption act and the right man to make it a success. McCrary of Iowa and Thompson of Indiana have the War and Navy portfolios,— well-reputed men both, and moderate in partisanship. The Postmaster-general is Key of Tennessee, who fought as a Confederate, and voted for Tilden. The chiefs of the Grant faction,— Conkling, Morton, Cameron, the Chandlers,— and Blaine with them, are scarcely recognized in the cabinet appointments. The selection signifies as marked a break with the late policy as is possible without dividing the party.

What shall be done about the South? Mr. Hayes is President by grace of the Republicans who are doing

their best to hold the state governments of Louisiana and South Carolina; the same returning-boards that gave him his title gave Chamberlain and Nicholls theirs — how can he disregard their claims to his support? Alas for them! a mightier power than Mr. Hayes is against them,— the march of events and of public opinion is bearing them down. Even Grant could no longer help them. On the last day of his term he answered a final despairing cry of Packard for recognition: "He does not believe that public opinion will longer support the maintenance of a state government in Louisiana by the use of military, and he — the President — must concur in this feeling." President Hayes treads in these last footsteps of President Grant, and takes the final decisive step. Chamberlain and Hampton are invited to Washington; there is courteous conference, but no possible compromise. The President recalls the troops from South Carolina, and the Chamberlain government vanishes into space. He sends a conciliatory commission to New Orleans:— No help for it, old friends who gave us the Presidency, your card house must tumble the instant these troops disappear, as they must needs do forthwith. The beaten party makes the best of it: Nicholls is recognized as governor by all, his legislature absorbs its rival, and in a sudden era of good feeling both parties unite in electing Judge Spofford, a liberal Democrat, to the United States Senate. The Federal government is done with the business of making state governments. The play is played out — the long play which has dragged on these many years, since South Carolina drew the sword to cut the bonds of the Union. The United States stand once more all on an equal footing; — sovereign each in its own sphere to shape its fortunes well or ill; but bound indissolubly in an organic union of their people.

Some crumbs of comfort there shall be for our party

friends at the South — collectorships and postmasterships shall be theirs yet a while longer. The returning-board of Louisiana shall have, for the everlasting disgrace on their names, such alleviation as fat Federal offices may bestow; albeit a blot thereby falls on the fair fame of the new Administration, which no future good deeds will wash out. In many of the party leaders the President's policy of reconciliation and reform causes disgust and dismay; there is a sullen opposition; Mr. Blaine loses no chance to make bitter war; there is a curious separation between the Administration and the chiefs of the party which nominally supports it. Nor can the old South be won to forget all its past, throw aside its political organization, and rush into the embrace of the new Administration, as Mr. Bowles would fain have it do. Mr. Hayes has no such extraordinary personality as to break down the old parties and create new ones outright. But he goes with the tide of the better forces; he deserves and wins the people's liking; he enters on a clean, moderate, and respectable administration. He vindicates from the first the opinion which the *Republican* held during the previous campaign,— that he represents the better kind of Republicanism.

The country breathes free, as almost in the same day it sees the danger of these last months tided peacefully over, the South's revolutionary period ended, and the work of reform begun. All winter the ship has been sailing through an unexplored channel, storms beating her, and rocks on either hand,— now she sails out upon an open and tranquil sea.

"And, of course, the next thing was to buoy the channel for future voyages? Of course the first care of the new Congress was to amply provide by law for the counting of the electoral vote?" To this day no such law has been passed!

CHAPTER XLV.

Public and Private Conflicts.

As he drew toward his fiftieth year, Mr. Bowles had entertained with more or less distinctness the hope of withdrawing from his newspaper and from active business. He had a vision of restful retirement,— of tasting unhurriedly the sweets of friendship and books and travel. It seems to have been partly the thought of setting his house in order for such a retirement that moved him to divide the *Republican* from the miscellaneous business of the establishment. The result was the exact opposite of his wish. The disruption, going far beyond his plans, created a rival of the *Republican*, required him to organize and train a new staff, and by his personal exertions to carry his paper through a period of various difficulty and peril. From this time, each succeeding year brought him some special burden or battle.

He had young and good material in his staff, out of which he was to educate his own successors. Mr. Warren had lately returned to the paper, and made good his chief's high expectations of him as an editorial writer. Mr. Charles H. Adams was another of the ablest of Mr. Bowles's pupils, and notable for the combination in his style of vigor and lightness,—the weighty thought winged with the terse phrase or the dash of humor.

Mr. Whiting came back, to take at first the local department, passing thence to book-reviews and general writing, and giving to the unrecognized work of a sub-editor a quality not only of literary finish but of wide culture and fine insight. In Mr. Edward P. Clark, Mr. Bowles had an apprentice who developed into an excellent managing editor. In this same year he began the training of a scholar, Mr. Solomon B. Griffin, who proved apt in catching his methods and principles, and rich in the newspaper instinct. In 1873 he began the initiation of his son and namesake, first into reporting and editing, and afterward into the business of the counting-room, and the general ordering of the paper. Before the disruption the editorial work had been distributed into well-defined departments, each in charge of its trained manager, so that the chief could do as little or as much as he pleased. Now for a while Mr. Bowles held the paper closely in his own hand, trying his workers first in one place and then in another, and making good by his own watchfulness any lack of experience or capacity. The *Republican* under its new circumstances became a better newspaper than it had ever been before. Whoever studies its files will see that its culmination begins from 1872.

The sleepy country village through whose streets Sam Bowles when a boy had driven his father's cow to pasture, and carried the Weekly *Republican* from house to house, had by a moderate and healthy growth come to be a thriving town of some thirty thousand inhabitants. Its distinguishing glory in a social sense is the prosperity and thrift of its common people. Most of the town consists of single houses, comfortable, tasteful, and modest, the homes of artisans, shop-keepers, and clerks, and usually owned by their occupants. Of abject poverty there is extremely little. There are less than half a dozen

millionaires; there are a considerable number of moderate fortunes represented by handsome but unpretentious houses and grounds. Springfield has been called "the city of homes." In this respect it is a New England town of the best type. In scarcely any other part of the world does the population show so high an average of well-being; hardly anywhere else are happiness and hope for the common people so legibly written.

Mr. Bowles had a deep love of his native town, which ripened with advancing years. He was never more watchful and active for the good of the community than in this latest period. The causes have been told which in 1872 brought him into such unpopularity as he had never before experienced. But the next year gave a proof of the estimation in which his townsmen really held him. He was offered a nomination for mayor,—a nomination which was equivalent to an election,—in a paper of which the three hundred signatures included the leading citizens of all parties, professions, nationalities, and churches. "Believing," said this invitation, "that party politics should not have a controlling influence in the municipal elections, and desiring a vigorous, intelligent, and wisely economical administration of our city affairs, we respectfully request your acceptance of a citizens' nomination for mayor." Not the least notable circumstance was that the movement originated with his old partners, the conductors of the *Union*.

He wrote in reply:

"I would rather be mayor of Springfield than hold any other office in the gift of my fellow-citizens. I would greatly like to help administer the public affairs of my native city, of which year by year I grow more fond and proud, and to come into closer personal relations with its people and its institutions." But, he continued, he felt obliged to decline,—first because he could not command the requisite time and strength, and

secondly he had "the feeling that any one having the opportunity and sharing the ambition of modern journalism can best serve the public interests by undivided service in his profession. Public opinion rather than mere personal leadership or party administration is fast becoming the great influence in both society and government, and in the direction and education of that agency, the press is only a valuable ally as it is and is felt to be independent of any personal share or interest in the details of the administration itself. Do not however regard me as in any sense indifferent to the compliment you pay me, or the honor you propose for me. They transcend all other compliments and honors of my life."

This same city election furnished the occasion of the *Republican's* most important libel suit. The paper had sharply fought a series of operations by which the city was investing nearly half a million of dollars in the railroad enterprises of Mr. Willis Phelps. Mr. Phelps was an old citizen of Springfield, of good private character, and connected with the Methodist church. He had grown rich as a railroad contractor, in which capacity he was more noted for the magnitude than the thoroughness of his works. He was an uneducated man; shrewd, pushing, unhampered by high standards or nice scruples.

The grants for his two railroads — the Athol and the Longmeadow — had been obtained by a series of operations extending through two years, and including the vigorous manipulation by Mr. Phelps and his family of local caucuses, both Republican and Democratic, of legislative committees, and of the city elections. The *Republican* had opposed each step in the series of grants by the city to the Athol and Longmeadow railroads, on the ground that the sums advanced were far beyond the necessities of the case and the interests of the city, and that they were promoted by disreputable means, including the corrupt use of money. The consummation of the last of

these grants was at stake in the pending city election. After Mr. Bowles had declined the nomination for mayor, the Phelps interest prevented the nomination of Colonel Thompson, who was unfriendly to the scheme, and gave the Democratic nomination to a man who was understood to be either neutral or friendly. The Phelps party again plied every resource to win the day. Just before the election, the *Republican* had a very sharp article entitled "Tweedism in Springfield." It opened with a reference to the man then behind prison bars in New York for plundering the city. It defined Tweedism as a man's control of the public authority to make contracts with himself more profitable than could be obtained were the business done between private parties. It declared:

"Mr. Phelps proved himself in the Athol transaction a public robber and a public corrupter, and he is now repeating the exhibition in the most audacious and flagrant manner. . . . The point is, that by deceiving and corrupting the public, and getting possession of the city government, he is getting the city to pay him two or three times as much for his railroads as it need do. . . . Having spoiled the city of $200,000, he is now using that money, and the power that its expenditure gives him, to despoil her of another sum nearly as large. . . . Mr. Phelps is the Boss Tweed of Springfield."

The Phelps party carried the election. They had already returned the Republican member of the family to the legislature; they now elected the Democratic candidate for mayor, and a city government friendly to their plans. Ultimately a proposal for a subscription of $150,000 to the stock of the Longmeadow road was accepted by the city government, sanctioned by the legislature, and submitted to the people at a special election, July 21, 1874. In this case, as in that of the Athol subscription, there were honest and intelligent

people who favored the plan; there was also a very different element which was as assiduously cultivated. On the day of the election the *Republican* said: "We understand from our reporters that about all the purchasable political material in the city,— all the 'workers' in the market, the men who run gangs, the captains of twenty-fives and fifties, the little cliques and interests, and even all the hacks to convey voters to the polls, have been engaged for to-day in the interest of the project that asks for the city's money. The expenses will be paid out of that money if it is voted." The money was voted by 1973 to 778 — about half of the full vote of the town. "Boss Phelps," said the *Republican*, "enters upon the third year of his reign in Springfield with a sixth victory. This victory was won like the former ones by industrious lobbying and skillful organization of the non-tax-paying voters working against a demoralized, paralyzed opposition." This was the last of Mr. Phelps's operations affecting the public treasury.

But with the *Republican* his controversy was only begun. He proposed to have the Supreme Court of Massachusetts determine whether that paper was a libeler or he a public robber. Immediately after the city election of 1873 and the article on "Tweedism in Springfield" he brought suit against the *Republican* for $200,000 damages. A writ of attachment to secure that sum was issued against the paper, a keeper was put into its office, and an interruption of its publication threatened. But Mr. Bowles obtained at once the signatures of substantial and leading citizens to a bond guaranteeing the payment of damages, if awarded, to the full amount. He was more than ready to try out the issue. "The *Republican* welcomes this arraignment," said the paper. "It is the first libel suit ever offered to it that involved the highest principles of journalism." Mr. Bowles began at once to engage

counsel, look up evidence, and prepare the defense. The matter was a labor and a care to him during the following winter, but when the suit was called for trial, in April, 1874, both parties were willing to postpone it, and it went over for another year.

In the autumn of 1873 came a business crash the country over, which proved to be the beginning of a long depression. Newspaper prosperity is especially sensitive to "bad times"; they are felt in the subscription list and yet more in the advertising. The *Republican* had weathered all the public and private storms of 1872 with a prosperous treasury, but now for the first time its dividends suffered. The general depression affected Mr. Bowles's private property, real estate and other. This made a new bond to hold him to his work till he should retrieve his fortune for those he was to leave, and for whom he was living.

In midsummer of 1874 he met at the railway station Chester W. Chapin, on his way to sail next day from Boston for a few weeks' pleasure trip to Europe. "Come with me, as my companion and guest," said Mr. Chapin. He hesitated, thought it over for an hour or two, and accepted. The two went together to London and Paris; they joined Mr. Bowles's eldest daughter and her husband who had just gone abroad for a wedding trip; they saw friends old and new; — Dr. Smith, of Springfield; Mr. Smalley, of the New York *Tribune*, in whose neighborhood at Seven Oaks they visited for a week; Sir Charles Dilke; Charles Kingsley, who had visited Mr. Bowles in the previous spring, and with whom in his new canonry in Westminster he now took a memorable breakfast; in Paris Murat Halstead and Mr. Huntington, of the *Tribune*, and other American friends. In Paris as in England there were days which he made charming for his children and companions; delightful little restaurant dinners;

strolls in the Champs Elysées. Mr. Bowles accepted the offer from Mr. Chapin with the frankness of a man who is ready to take kindnesses or to give them, and Mr. Chapin had his return in the most charming of companionship, and an episode of social enjoyment such as the sober millionaire had probably never tasted. Yet for Mr. Bowles the indulgence had an after-sting. The favor, accepted hastily and in good faith, was one which his own principles as a journalist should have forbidden. The editor could not afford to take such a gift from the head of a great corporation. When Mr. Chapin's transactions in the lease of the Ware River to the Boston and Albany were criticised, the *Republican's* defense of him brought imputations of motive; and when, just after the European trip, the paper supported him for Congress against the editor's brother-in-law, it would have strengthened Mr. Bowles's position to have been free from all semblance of obligation,— though rumor grossly exaggerated the nature and extent of the obligation.

This congressional contest was part of a political campaign in which the *Republican's* principles won a signal success. Mr. Alexander's candidacy was a part of that domination of a ring of office-holders and office-seekers, against which this year marked a victorious revolt. The course of the *Republican* was clear and consistent. But for Mr. Bowles the contest had a trying personal aspect. Mr. Alexander was his sister's husband. There had always been friendly accord between the families of the three surviving children of the elder Bowles. The mother lived with Mr. and Mrs. Alexander from the marriage of Frank — who had been the "home son"— until her own death in 1871. At this house the three families always met for the great New England festival of Thanksgiving day. The boys and girls of the households, like their elders, were on cordial terms,—

family affection was a deep trait in the Bowles blood. Between Mr. Alexander and his brothers-in-law the personal relations were friendly though scarcely intimate. He was a bank president; a keen, pushing man, of popular manners, and integrity in private affairs; but he regarded politics altogether on the material and business side, as a field for personal advancement, and his political methods were more akin to the ward politics of New York than the standard which the *Republican* was wont to maintain. In advance of the convention, Mr. Bowles in the paper met his proposed nomination with a pronounced opposition, in which there was no bitterness or personal disrespect, and in private he used friendly urgency with him to decline the nomination. It was with the expectation that he would do this that Mr. Bowles went to the convention at Chester. But when the tempting prize was put into the hands of the ambitious man, he took it. Mr. Bowles on returning from the convention took a drive through the pleasant woods of the "Plum-tree road," with an old friend, and showed himself deeply dejected by what had happened and what was to happen. He said, "To-day has parted hands that will only be joined over a coffin." It was a true prophecy. Another friend suggested to him that he should keep out of the impending battle and "go a-fishing." His answer was, "The *Republican* has no brothers-in-law." Some who heard of this remark quoted it as an instance of heartlessness. But if a judge, in deciding upon a case which touched a relative, had said: "This court has no brothers-in-law,"—who would have taken it amiss? In its sharp warfare against the candidate, the *Republican* said not a harsh word against the man apart from his politics. But the affair left a deep and lasting wound.

The Phelps libel suit was finally tried in the later spring of 1875 before Judge Endicott of the Supreme

Court. Plaintiff and defendant had able counsel and spared no effort. Mr. Phelps was represented by Judge B. F. Thomas, Henry Morris, A. M. Copeland, and M. B. Whitney; Mr. Bowles's lawyers were R. H. Dana, Jr., Charles Allen, N. A. Leonard, and E. B. Maynard. He was himself most assiduous in the preparation of the defense, and its main lines were marked out by him. Under a new statute, the parties to a civil cause could by mutual consent waive the employment of a jury and leave the decision to the judge. Mr. Phelps elected to do this, and Mr. Bowles assented, though equally willing to go to a jury. The trial lasted nine days. On both sides the real issue was directly met, and the case was tried essentially on its merits. The defense was "truth and privilege,"— the truth of the libel, and the right of an editor, not exceptionally, but in common with all other citizens, to freely discuss personal character when public interest requires, provided he be not untruthful or malicious. The testimony produced was principally as to what was done by Mr. Phelps, in person or through his sons, at caucuses, elections, and in the legislature. The defense was not allowed to rest at all on public rumor or general belief; the court required it to prove specific acts. As its principal witnesses the defense called Mr. Willis Phelps, his two sons, and men whom they had employed at elections. On the plaintiff's side the evidence was in rebuttal of the allegations of corruption, and there was also a strong array of testimony from well-known citizens as to the good personal repute of Mr. Phelps. The defendant's counsel claimed that there had been proved a series of unscrupulous manipulations of caucuses, committees, and elections, in the interests of a private job; that Mr. Bowles's duty as a journalist required the plain exposition of such wrongs; and that the harshness of particular expressions was not

to be too nicely judged, in the case of an earnest and needed defense of the public interest. The plaintiff's advocates maintained that nothing had been proved against Mr. Phelps or his sons, beyond such activity for their own interests as was customary and perfectly legitimate; and made a not ineffective appeal for their gray-haired client, held up to scorn after an honorable life by comparison with the most notorious criminal of the time.

Judge Endicott pronounced his decision with judicial scrupulousness. He declared the evidence conclusive as to great improprieties on the part of the plaintiff. He dwelt upon the management which secured the passage of the legislative act of 1872 as highly unbecoming and dangerous. He gave special consideration to the means employed to carry the vote of the city in 1872 for the Athol subscription; no direct bribery had been proved, but the free expenditure of money, and the character of the means employed, showed the use of an influence essentially corrupt. The allegations of the *Republican* had been in the main made good by the evidence. At one point, however, the defendant had failed to justify the paper's words. It had said of Mr. Phelps: "Having spoiled the city of $200,000, he is now using that money, and the power that its expenditure gave him, to despoil her of another sum nearly as large." This charge, said the judge, has not been made good before the court. Further, the defendant has not absolutely cleared himself of the "express malice" contemplated by the law, as there had been a "heated discussion" between him and the plaintiff, which was of some weight as an evidence of ill feeling. In view of all the facts of the case, the court pronounced that the plaintiff was entitled to damages of — one hundred dollars.

Mr. Bowles was a wrathful man when the verdict was reported to him. But the plaintiff had far less reason to

be satisfied. Both sides filed exceptions to the judge's rulings, and declared that they would carry the case before the full bench. But the appeal was allowed by both parties to hang suspended—and hangs so yet. The hundred dollars was never paid. The moral advantage of the verdict lay altogether on the side of the newspaper. The ultimate issue showed that in the Athol matter certainly the public had been made to suffer. The road was completed; but, instead of the dividends which Mr. Phelps had told the city it might expect, the entire stock was soon wiped out by foreclosure in behalf of the bondholders, of whom the principal one was Mr. Phelps, and the road passed into the hands of the very Boston and Albany road with which it had been promised it would compete. The Longmeadow subscription, having been cut down by 33 per cent. from the sum first proposed, turned out better; of the city's 1500 shares, 220 indeed were sold at 40, but the remainder continued to pay a moderate interest. But the gravamen of the *Republican's* charges concerned something more serious than dollars and cents—it was the corruption of the caucus and the polls. The mischief of the situation was that such things should be done by one like Willis Phelps, who was not, according to his lights, a viciously disposed man. When, a few years later, the old man went to his grave in peace, no one was disposed to treat his memory harshly, and the *Republican* spoke kindly of his merits and mildly of his faults. But he happened to be the conspicuous local representative of that disposition which looks on the public treasury as a stray milch cow, the lawful prize of any one who has the skill to milk her. To pack a caucus, hoodwink a legislature, or pay for the poll-taxes and the drinks of a crowd of voters, is only the handling and coaxing necessary to keep the beast quiet while the

pail is filled. The *Republican* made itself the watchman to scare off such depredators and render their occupation disreputable; and when the stones were flying, the cow did not always know her friends from her foes.

The trial of this suit in addition to his other labors taxed Mr. Bowles's strength almost to its last limits. In this as in everything he could not put the responsibility upon other people,— he charged himself with nearly as much care as if he had been his own lawyer. There was much more than a pecuniary stake in the contest; the function of the paper which he most prized — the defense of the public morality against its corrupters — was to be vindicated before the highest authority of the commonwealth, and in the midst of the home community. The culmination of the long labor and suspense in a trial which lasted through nine days kept him under an extreme nervous tension.

The same season brought him an experience more painful than any that had preceded. His brother Frank (sometimes called Ben) had for many years been in charge of the counting-room of the paper. He had originally been trained in the banking business, but came into the newspaper as one of the later partners. The two brothers had always been on brotherly terms, and the relations between their two families were very cordial. "Uncle Frank was very much an uncle to us children," said one of his nieces. He was a man of upright and blameless character, of warm though undemonstrative affections, and refined tastes. Those who penetrated within a certain reserve and stiffness of manner, found a fine and lovable quality in him. His inclination toward books was stronger than that of his older brother, and as a boy he was the better scholar of the two. At an early age he had traveled in southern Europe, and his strong relish was for literature, art, and field sports. He would

have been thoroughly at home in the life of an English country gentleman, occupied in his library, or in the field with his dog and gun, or with his family and guests. For a business life he had not enough push nor enough suavity of manner. He brought to his work integrity and fidelity, but his want of dynamic force and of tact and graciousness in meeting men, which had always been felt, became a grave drawback when the management of the counting-room, under the stress of business rivalry and dull times, was a more critical and important matter than before. In the spring of 1875 there was a degree of friction between the two brothers in their business relations. The elder was dissatisfied with some of the younger's methods, and considered that his own directions and suggestions were not sufficiently heeded. It was his judgment that the counting-room needed a different kind of administration. His brother had too much of the family stiffness of temper to be very pliable when differences arose. Whether there was on the part of the younger a real and hopeless inadequacy to the work under its new requirements, or whether the knot was one that might have been untangled with time and patience,—the elder determined to cut the knot. He wrote to his brother a letter, saying that it was desirable for the common interest that he should give up the department he held; — that he had better take a year's vacation, with full continuance of salary, as well as of his share in the ownership of the paper, and that at the end of the year arrangements for the future could be considered.

The younger brother took it as dismissal and disgrace. He was sensitive, and his pride was deeply injured; he was affectionate, and the injury had come from his brother. He had lately built a fine house, on the site of the father's old home, and was living there with his

young family. Now he felt as if without fault of his own his life was uprooted. His woful look told to all who saw him of a deep hurt within. Much sympathy was felt for him in Springfield. The particulars of what had happened were known to very few. In this as in other cases Mr. Bowles would not justify himself by telling his own story. The younger brother went with his wife for travel in Europe and Egypt. He wrote some letters for the *Republican*. Some amicable correspondence passed between the brothers, partly with reference to getting a consulship for the younger. Finally the elder sent the younger, in a long, kind letter, a proposal for a certain line of work to be done for the paper, of a literary instead of a business character, including a series of letters from the approaching Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia,— at the old rate of salary, which had never been interrupted. When this letter reached Frank in the spring of 1876 he was sick in Paris. There were germs of disease in his constitution, and he had contracted a fever in Rome. The sickness ended a few weeks later in his death. After the return of his family, a memorial service was held for him in Springfield. "Never," said a friend, "did I see Mr. Bowles look so sad as on that day."

Such troubles as these helped to wear out his life. He suffered keenly too from the constant alienations which were the consequence of the *Republican's* criticisms on parties and individuals. It is remarked by Mr. Frederic Myers, in writing of Marcus Aurelius, and noting the excessive clemency which was a defect in his administration: "The task of curbing and punishing other men, of humiliating their arrogance, exposing their falsity, upbraiding their sloth, is in itself so distasteful, when there is no personal rivalry or resentment to prompt it, that it is sure to be performed too gently, or neglected for more congenial duty." That was just the task in which Mr.

Bowles excelled, and the motive which nerved him to it was a high sense of public duty, supported by a temper courageous but without malice. This office of public censor and critic demands that the man who exercises it, if he is to have any peace and comfort, should live apart from those among whom his lash falls, or else that he should have the skin of a rhinoceros. But Mr. Bowles lived in a small community whose members all knew each other, and his nature craved friendship with all — and his censorship cost him very dearly. Of the community about him, only a small part fully appreciated his principles of journalism or did entire justice to his character. The *Republican* was praised and read for its brightness, but a not infrequent criticism upon it was, that it had no principles. The only "principles" which many people can understand consist in allegiance to a party, a creed, or a name. Nor is it for a moment to be claimed that Mr. Bowles was faultless in his administration of public or private justice. He had his full share of inconsistencies. Men who suffered from the undeserved strictures of the paper, and its unwillingness to retract, could tell their own stories with the right and pathos on their side. Sometimes Mr. Bowles's independence ran into caprice. He was fully sensible of the benefit to a paper, as an advertisement, of being talked about, for good or bad, and he took advantage sometimes of the fact with a relish of mischievous enjoyment. Once in a while he rode a hobby until the world laughed at him. In particular, he for several years brought forward the name of the elder Charles Francis Adams, as the man for the hour, until it became a stock subject for joking among his brethren of the press.

Though he declined public office when it sought him, as inconsistent with his newspaper duties, he did not make those duties a ground for avoiding assiduous per-

sonal service to the community. No one was more active and liberal in forwarding schemes for the common welfare. He was keenly interested in the public schools; he was one of the men who built up the City Library,— a library among the best of its class, and one of Springfield's most valuable institutions,— serving actively as a director for twenty years, from its foundation till his death, and contributing liberally to its funds. He was a generous giver for the erection of the beautiful Church of the Unity. All projects for improving and beautifying the town won quick sympathy from him. To detail all his services in such directions would require a glance at every branch of the city's later history. In the winter before his final illness,— the winter of 1876–7, when the disputed Presidency was engaging all citizens and especially all journalists,— he found time among his various duties to share in two notable local projects. One was for a radical amendment of the city charter. The work of drawing up a new charter was committed by the city government to a committee of which Judge William S. Shurtleff was the chairman, and he substantially performed the work. He carefully sketched a charter differing essentially from the one in force, introducing some alterations which then were very novel, and some now recognized as desirable by all intelligent municipal reformers. Mr. Bowles invited Judge Shurtleff to show him the work, and it was discussed between them at several interviews. His criticisms and suggestions were very helpful in perfecting it. One change from the old charter was the separation of the mayor from the legislative department, allowing him a right of recommendation and veto, but leaving him no longer at the head of committees that shape legislation. The executive power was concentrated more fully in the mayor's hands, while as a check on abuse of his prerogatives he

was made removable by a two-thirds vote of the city council for malfeasance. The aldermen were to hold office for three years, one-third being elected every year, instead of an annual election of the whole board. The most significant alteration was in constituting executive boards, to be in charge respectively of the fire and police departments, the public works, and the finances, each board consisting of the mayor, certain other executive officials, and two citizens appointed by the city council in alternate years for two years each. The broad design of these new features was to insure to the public business something of the same concentration, stability, and conservatism with which great private corporations are administered, and to remove it from liability to violent fluctuations with the changes of the political tide at every yearly election. The charter was carefully discussed in the committee; was approved without any dissent by the city aldermen and common councilmen; was then sent to the legislature, examined and recommended by the judiciary committees of both branches, approved by the Senate unanimously, and by the House with only one voice in opposition; and then was submitted to a vote of the city at a special election. There had been almost no public opposition, and its acceptance was generally looked for. But it was defeated. All the petty bosses were jealous of a form of government which would concentrate responsibility, and diminish the power of wire-pullers in ward caucuses. A prejudice was stirred up among one class of the popular sovereigns which expressed itself in the words, "We don't want no king!" In another class there was the apathy so frequent at an election which makes no appeal to party passion,— and, in fine, the measure so intelligently planned made shipwreck through the selfishness of a few, and the ignorance or indifference of many.

This winter saw the initiation in Springfield of a movement elsewhere begun, whose rise may perhaps in the eyes of posterity be of more importance than any other event of the period. That characteristic spirit of the time, which is well described as "the enthusiasm of humanity," has expressed itself among other forms in "the new charity." Its essential idea is that for the heedless giving of alms to the poor there shall be substituted the contact of an intelligent personal friendship, to lead them into self-help. The special form of the movement in America has been the organization in cities of associations which shall coöperate with and harmonize the various existing agencies of public charity; and especially shall superintend a personal and continuous visitation of all applicants for help. Among the first conspicuous instances of such an association was the "Relief Society" of Germantown, which soon extended to Philadelphia. The hard times which had lasted since 1873 made the problem of relieving poverty a pressing one everywhere. The *Republican* took up the local question very seriously in December, 1876. It pointed out that in the past year the city had given outdoor relief to 1600 persons; that its annual expense for this purpose was from $20,000 to $25,000; and that most of this sum was necessarily given with little investigation and often with injurious results. A few days later it urged that "the domiciliary visitation of the poor is the great need of the city"; and called for a strong local charitable association to take this work in hand. It kept the matter before the public; described the Germantown society which had been established a year or two before; and said "Let us have a Springfield Relief Society, irrespective of party lines. Let the pastors rally their churches, the First Church leading off by right of its seniority, to send a representation of each one's best men and women, to unite in a preliminary

meeting for consultation and organization." To bring about a practical result of this sort, any newspaper is almost powerless,—as the *Republican* often found,—if it works alone; but its aid may be invaluable and decisive when there are even one or two private workers to put their shoulders to the wheel. In this case several women who had been among the most valuable public servants of Springfield were deeply engaged in the undertaking. Probably the chief credit belongs to the late Mrs. Gurdon Bill. Active allies were found among the clergy, and notably in Washington Gladden, who took a leading part in the enterprise. In February the "Union Relief Association" was organized, and successfully launched. Mr. Bowles attended the meetings at which the organization was shaped, and repeatedly at a moment of uncertainty he framed the motion which crystallized the hesitating elements into the right form. He volunteered to undertake singly what is usually the most disagreeable part of such an enterprise,—the raising of money. He went about with the subscription paper, and in this novel capacity found everywhere the heartiest welcome and response. Large contributions were not sought for. A sum of $4000 was raised without difficulty. The Union Relief began and continued an excellent work. Partly through its agency, as well as through the gradual improvement of business, the city's expense for outdoor relief was cut down to a small fraction of its former amount, "tramps" became infrequent, the swelling tide of pauperism was checked, and a sentiment of self-help began to be cultivated in quarters where the habit had been toward dependence drifting into beggary.

While Mr. Bowles was from time to time engaged by these various labors and strifes, he was every day producing a newspaper which was a model of journalistic art. He was exercising a watchful and sagacious leader-

ship on all the public questions of the time, both general and local. He was training and inspiring his subordinates, and so saturating them with his ideas and methods that the paper was to be governed by his spirit long after he had left it. He was successfully caring for its financial interests during a long commercial depression. He was studying the welfare of each member of his family, keeping up by visits and correspondence a wide circle of friendships, and giving life and cheer by his very presence. And these years, crowded with activities, fruitful beyond all earlier ones, bearing steadfastly the load not only of toil but of alienations and censures, were lived while he was in daily struggle with the nervous weakness that had long been sapping his strength. The courage of the soldier on the battle-field is a slight matter compared to such victorious endurance as this.

In the summer of 1876 he felt his vitality to be perilously low, though any serious anxiety was but temporary. He resorted for a time to a rigid diet, almost exclusively of milk. His ill health was so chronic and familiar that his friends scarcely felt unusual concern. He made very little talk about his condition, but at the end of a letter to Charles Allen, in regard to other matters, he describes his new regimen, with the comment only, "all which is to enable me to go on with my work and escape paralysis." About this time he had a very slight obscure seizure of which he did not then tell his family;— while descending the office stairs, he found himself sitting down, dazed and unconscious of what had just preceded. His mother had died of a paralytic stroke.

Mention has been made of the old black horse, Pone, who served the family faithfully for many years. At last he was adjudged to be past active service, and was sold for a nominal price, on condition that he should have good treatment to the end of his days. His new owner dis-

covered in him powers that had never been suspected. He was put upon the race-track of a neighboring village, and, like the parson's horse in Holmes's verse, he beat all the favorites of the local turfmen. He trotted a mile low down in the "forties," and under his new name of Editor ran a brief and glorious career, until one day he dropped dead on the race-course. Pone and his master were not unlike each other. The man too, just when he was looking for well-earned quiet pasturage for the remainder of his days, had been called to surpass his earlier achievements, and to show a new, heroic strain of power before the final rest was reached.

CHAPTER XLVI.

Letters: 1873–1877.

In these latest years, more than ever, if possible, of his heart and thought was given to his family. His eldest daughter returned from Europe in 1871, full of the hope and purpose of becoming her father's helper. But Nature has a way of interrupting such plans in favor of views of her own, and there ensued soon an engagement with Mr. Thomas Hooker, of New Haven, which was followed by marriage in June, 1874. The second daughter, Mary, was married to Mr. William H. King, of Springfield, in April, 1875. Mr. Bowles's relation to his daughters partook of the motherly quality. They gave him their confidences; he shared their interests and their plans; he made their friends his friends; there was near and tender intimacy between them. The mother fostered this relationship. While the girls were still young, and the father in the press of daily occupation had but little close relation to them, she arranged for journeys and visits to be made together, that so their acquaintance and mutual dependence might ripen. He trained them to take responsibility. In his watchfulness over them there was equal stimulus and sympathy. He loved to look on at their croquet parties and piazza teas. The gala night of the family was on Saturday, when the father was at home.

To give up his daughters in marriage cost him something of what it is wont to cost a mother. But from the hour of their engagements he set himself to promote their happiness in the new connection, to alleviate and reconcile for them any conflict of claims and duties, to make safe and pleasant paths for their feet. He took delight in planning the details of his eldest daughter's wedding. Friendly hands decked the whole house with laurel blossoms, annunciation lilies, and all the flowers of June; only friends were bidden as guests; all went freely in and out through house and grounds; the bride wore simple muslin; the former pastor, and builder of the house, Francis Tiffany, was present to speak the consecrating words,— every circumstance expressed simplicity, freedom, and love. Never, said his friends, did the father look so handsome as on that day,— never did his eyes soften with so tender a light.

The daughter and the new son went to Europe, to find a few weeks later an unexpected happy reunion with the father for a while, and then to be parted from him for many months. Next year the household gave up its second daughter. Another year, and the old home welcomed back for a time the first pair, bringing with them a baby grandchild. This little girl they left, when obliged by the father's health — a source of much anxiety in these years — to make a journey to the far West, in the summer of 1871. While they were absent, an imperative telegram from Dr. Smith summoned them back,— the baby was sick. At every possible point on their return they were met by telegrams from their father, with messages of cheer. The first message was: "Old woman" (the doctor) "relieved — baby taking chicken broth." Then presently: "Young lady sits at window and throws kisses to me passing," and so on, till they reached home and the anxiety was over.

His letters during these years have less of personal disclosure than at some other periods. The members of the little group to whom he had written so fully in Germany were now too near him to need letters. He made few journeys so long as to give occasion for much home correspondence; and his strength was taxed in so many directions as to leave small opportunity for the leisurely and intimate letters which reveal the inner life. It was one of those times when the strongest sentiments and purposes express themselves in deeds and not in words. What has been said of books is true of letters — the best ones are those which are never written, but take finer expression in action.

To Mr. Dawes, after he had been defeated by Mr. Boutwell as successor to Vice-President Wilson's place in the Senate:

March 14, 1873.

I am really and sorely disappointed! The last four or five days of the canvass had warmed me up from hope into faith. But our old instinct that "the Machine" was too strong for us, proved true. I am really quite sorry and sympathetic. I *did* want to have you get that place, now! I felt that under its inspiration you would realize, not only your ideal of yourself, but my own ideal of you.

Well, it isn't for you to be disheartened under the disappointment, nor me for you! There is work for us both to do — good work and plenty of it. Let us do it according to our lights, and take our chances for recognition. Some time, I want to talk over the last year with you, and this winter's canvass. The *Republican* did what it could — not, perhaps, according to your taste and mind — but more effectually, I am sure, than if it had been personally more agreeable. Anyhow, all the sort of fellows, whether with the Republican party or on its confines, who think with the *Republican*, were for you, and did what they could for you. Many of them were rebellious at first; but I think, during the last two or three weeks, that all our set of fellows, open and quasi, were your efficient supporters. You

belong to us, and we to you. That is what I have always told them; and when the sheep and goats are divided in Massachusetts, it will appear so. Now, I want the division to take place, and the sooner the better. I am only afraid that Butler will not come on — that Boutwell will coax him off the field, and delay this thing.

I am off, to-day, with Mrs. Bowles, for a six weeks' vacation in California. I am very much worn out, and need the rest as never before. But the fight at Springfield is over now. The *Republican* was never so strong in any respect as at this moment, and I go away without any uneasiness. I wish you could come along. It is the best thing you could do. The spring months in California are, according to all accounts, delightful,— and you could probably have the advantage of me in getting a pass over the Pacific out of "the Old Shovel!"

To C. W. Bryan.

November 15, 1873.

I am sure I owe much of the very generous and flattering words with which the *Union* has been speaking of me these last weeks to your personal friendship. They have touched me very deeply,— done me a great deal of good,— and made me very grateful.

Unexpected and astonishing is the complimentary invitation to be mayor that has come out of the *Union's* advocacy. While it has been very embarrassing, it has also been quite gratifying — it is the highest and most agreeable compliment I ever had in my life. But the best part of it all — that which gives me the keenest satisfaction — is that you and Pomeroy and Phelps did it — and that you could have inspired and backed such words of generous appreciation and high praise as those in which the *Union* has spoken of me.

To Mr. Dawes, after a speech attacking as extravagant the estimates laid before Congress by the Administration:

December 11, 1873.

It is a good speech. It takes up life where you dropped it two or three years ago. Go ahead; but beware of that vice

to which the *Republican* is so stern an enemy — in others — that of "nagging" overmuch!

. . . Blaine's strong point was his personal and political hold on the reformer set — the *Evening Post*, Chicago *Tribune*, and *Nation* crowd. But these I think he has permanently estranged by these new committees of his. [Committees, said the *Republican*, which the Speaker had so made up as to favor inflation, a high tariff, and the railroad corporations.] The blow may not be recognized, but I think he will wake up to find that his constituency has been demoralized and his strength gone.

. . . I'm afraid I have lost my invitation to another of ———'s good dinners. It is a pity, considering how good they are, and how good a fellow he is. But, confound him, why need he be putting himself in the way of our virtue?

To a woman, on writing Washington letters to the *Republican*:

December 3, 1873.

I think you can do it. Go ahead and try. I cannot promise to pay, because the *Republican* is already too expensively conducted, and is cutting off all paid correspondence that it can. But with that proviso, I shall be glad to give you welcome — and criticism! Don't be too ambitious; you will most naturally deal with social and personal topics, and the surface of events,— but your own good sense will suggest to you to avoid equally being sinister and Jenkinsy. There is a charming middle ground for a woman's Washington letter, which has not yet been quite seized by any one. I have a good deal of hope that it is waiting for you!

January 12, 1874.

It isn't a success — it is a triumph, a real glory. Go ahead. You will get out of my patronage only too soon.

January 30, 1874.

They continue to be first-rate. The original letter was the best piece of writing. The latter ones have been more interesting — especially to the millinery mind. I hardly know

exactly where and how to criticise them. Once in a while your rhetoric gets borne off a little wildly on the sea of silks; and again, as in the allusion to Bristed's German home and experiences, you are not quite clear enough for the carnal-minded reader. Some of your sentences too might be profitably broken in two, and a period put in the place of a semicolon. Study well the art of punctuation. It is the clear-starch of composition. Don't write too much, nor in haste, nor simply because you have agreed with yourself to do it. Give it your very best hours, or none at all. . . . You have begun so grandly well, have shown such real capacity with your pen, that I want to have you insist severely on only the best work or none at all. Care and self-discipline, now, will tell greatly by and by.

April 25, 1874.

I have written you several letters in purpose the last month, but the absorption of a new and pressing vocation—that of preparing a lawsuit for trial—has forbidden the execution. You are certainly entitled to be "distinguished" hereafter for "the one thing," at least, that you can do—you can write good newspaper letters. The series constituted absolutely the best beginning that I ever knew any person to make.

But I am glad you stopped as you did. They were attracting a good deal of interest, and so of curiosity, and, for one reason and another, various people were trying quite sharply to find out the author; some of them, I am sorry to say, with mischievous intent. . . . So you see there are perils in this sort of society correspondence. Moreover, it isn't the sort of literary work that you ought to be ambitious of excelling in. It is good enough to nib your pen on, but you must go higher, and can. There are plenty of broader and better themes, even at Washington, for so ready and suggestive a writer as you; and either in the *Republican* or elsewhere I beseech you to seek them.

Does all this sound a little ungracious and overcritical? I don't mean it to be in the least,—I only want to do my duty in return both for my promise and your really very attractive series of letters.

To Frank B. Sanborn.

November 18, 1873.

This panic struck us badly — right in the heart of the advertising season; and as we were running close to income before, it carried us below. I have had to make a raid on expenses all around. . . . I shall enforce economy along the whole line, and if I can keep my health tolerably well shall bring things out another year, somehow. I see there is an appeal made for R——. I must do something, but it comes at a very bad time for me. Personally I have been running ahead of income for two years, heavily, and have had to cut off comforts and indulgences that I really need for my health. But if I can run a year or two I shall work out.

The mayor business was very pleasant. There were grave reasons why I should say yes; and, funny as it seems, I should have been triumphantly elected,— but I could not afford it.

To George W. Smalley, in London.

February 3, 1874.

. . . There is nothing new over here which you don't see in the papers. Politically things are going to pieces, which is right. A few impatient people, like Schurz and Charles F. Adams and David A. Wells, are eager to begin reconstruction, but there is nothing to reconstruct yet. The Granges, and the new order akin to it for the mechanics, are being organized just now in great numbers. I doubt if they do what Know-nothingism did, or, rather, do it in the same way. They will disintegrate and destroy; it doesn't seem to me they have the elements to create. All the while there is a growing disposition, which you can hardly realize over there, to vote independently and for the best men without much regard to their mere personal popularity. It is a mighty interesting time to be at home, to be out of the fight except as an amateur, and see the glory of God! I wonder more and more that you can stay where you are!

. . . As a rule very few newspapers in America have made money the past year. The prediction of Raymond, some

years ago, that the expenses would grow faster than the income, is being steadily and growingly realized. . . . Commend me most cordially to Mrs. Smalley; and tell dear old Huntington, the next time you see him, that he grows more and more to be one of the figures in the landscape of my life.

To Mrs. Runkle.

March 3, 1874.

. . . I more and more wish you could have written that chapter for Miss Brackett's book. It needn't have been long. But you could have put, as it needs to be put, the general question of the responsibilities and duties of woman to herself and to society. The lamb has been protected by the wolf long enough. She should have a care of herself; and so far as laws and social customs are concerned, man and woman should come together on a platform of perfect equality. She should have as much responsibility for his virtue as he for hers. This is not a violation of nature, but simply the freedom and the responsibility of nature. As to the work of life, too, there is more now than men can do, while the women escape their share. I go for a new division. As to virtue, it stands to reason that a woman will care for her own more surely and safely than the one being interested to despoil it. All this has not been simply and clearly and logically put by the representatives of the new order. There is too much talk about rights, too little about responsibilities and duties. Rightly stated, I do believe this cause would greatly change its relations to the public, which has been taught to look at it simply from the narrow, technical, and incidental one of suffrage, or the seemingly alarming one of "free love." But you know all about it. No woman has a clearer conception of the whole question than you, and I do want to have you put into it the best piece of writing you ever did, of something like ten or twenty book pages.

. . . By the way, I hope Canon Kingsley will see you, and you him. He spent a night and a day with us last week, and we enjoyed him immensely. He is a hearty, jolly, many-sided, open-minded, liberal, fair-drinking, generous-smoking, nervous

Englishman, who says we of New England have the meanest country, the most beastly climate, and the most charming people, he ever met in all his life. Especially has he an open mind for original character. Nothing but the dull and commonplace frets him; and the average American Episcopalian, you may well infer, is likely to be his chief trial.

The following letter inclosed an article from the Boston *Herald*, "How Mr. Dawes Weakens," in criticism of his course in regard to the currency.

To H. L. Dawes.

February 11, 1874.

I presume plenty of *friends* have, with malicious kindness, shown you this article from the Boston *Herald*. I send it to you to say that, unjust as it is in great degree, it is the blow of friendly hands, and should be treated somewhat in the way of a warning. Haskell, the editor of the *Herald*, and Pulsifer, the publisher, two of the best gentlemen connected with the New England press, went through here to-day on their way to Florida. They will be back at Washington about the first of March, and I want to have them see you and Sumner, and have you and Sumner pay them some little attention. Sumner ought to invite them to dinner with their wives, and you and your "girls." They are gentlemen and ladies, every way, and they are thoroughly honest and independent in their profession, and mean to do good work and stand by the honest men everywhere. Look out for them. They promised me they would send their cards to you on your arrival.

I am very glad you saw Godkin of the *Nation*. I hope hereafter he will treat you a little more fairly. I don't object so much to his discipline,— though with true family instinct the *Republican* rather claims monopoly of that sort of business,— but to have him denounce you in the same paragraph that he praised Garfield was a little too exasperating! Somebody in Berkshire, I fancy, had warped his mind against you, and no mind is more capable of warps than his. But he is a man of first-class ability and really high purpose. He cannot quite conquer the infirmities of his birth and education, nor his

temperamental morbidness of feeling. Nor has he been able to rise superior to a little circle of narrow wise men at Cambridge.

What marvelous capacity for folly Butler shows! He has only to be let alone and he destroys himself.

Don't forget to remember that Washington is *not* the country, and that the parties have ceased now to be the people.

The following was written after Mr. Dawes's speech of February 12, urging retrenchment, instead of inflation or borrowing, on the part of the government.

To H. L. Dawes.

February 14, 1874.

We have not the full text yet, but I think it is a success. Still, I am prepared to see this and your letter about the salary make a sharp division, possibly become the entering wedges for a departure. Keep your head level and your soul serene! Don't strike too soon, but be sure to strike at the right moment, and become aggressive and carry the war into Africa when the other side make the opportunity for you — if they dare to. I suppose there will be fresh talk of the impropriety of staying on your committee. It seems to me you should say this,— that whenever the Speaker, as the organ of the party and the House, desires you to resign, you will do so; whenever the majority of the Republican members indicate such a wish, and it is acquiesced in or supported by the Speaker, the same. But I would not recognize for a moment any amenability to the Departments or the White House. The best part of your speech, it seems to me, was where you point out the sources of economy. Stick to that strong,— the reduction of the navy-yards, the consolidation of our armories and arsenals, the abandonment of five-sixths of our fortifications, and the knife very generally into all the revenue service.

. . . I see the correspondents, more or less, are infected with the Washington atmosphere; but you will find the press at home all right, I am sure. The country is ripe for following a leader in the direction of reform and economy, no matter where it cuts.

The following was written after meeting and parting from his daughter and her husband in London.

To Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Hooker.

Hotel Westminster, Rue de la Paix,
Paris, Friday, August 14, 1874.

Dear Kids: "When you are in doubt, go to Paris." We did yesterday, and are as above. We shall stay here a week I think, possibly all next week. Then—we don't know, but probably back to England for the remaining three weeks of our time. This is your chance, therefore, if you want it, and judge it. My head is against your breaking your plans and coming to see a little more of the old man. My heart—well—of course it wants all it can have. But after all—it would be a little more pleasure and some more pain. I don't expect you. Of course it was silly not to know we were to come to Paris before you went to Holland—but I am trying to be silly.

It was a dull day in London, Friday, after you left. The Doctor [Smith] got off, full of feeling, as he always is—and we were glad to take refuge next day in the horrors of the Channel. It was quite rough, and though I held my own, my head still suffers from the struggle. We like this hotel. It is very quiet and comfortable—and Paris *does* live so much better than London. The Langham is an abomination. I hope we sha'n't go there again. The "swell" room was two poun' ten (£2 10s.) a day, and Chapin accepted it like an infant. I believe there never was so amiable a man. Huntington is as charming as ever, and Paris has some things of interest going on just now, though it is not high season.

No more now, but love in quantity and depth and height and length.

To Charles Allen.

Paris, August 25, 1874.

My surprising vacation is just half over. I sailed July 25. I hope to reach New York September 25. I am having a good time, so far all in London and Paris. Two weeks of the time (one in London and one here) Sallie and Tom have been with

me. They left yesterday for Germany, and gave their final good-bye. What we shall do with the rest of our time is not so clear. But I am indifferent,— so I can avoid travel and care and work and sight-seeing, beyond the shops, etc., I care very little. I have gained a good deal in strength and "tone"— and my head is just now beginning to show tokens of improvement. But it has been and is a very obstinately weak and weary instrument of life, and ought to have a suspension for an indefinite period. At London, Dr. Smith, Smalley of the *Tribune*, and Dilke (Sir Charles) helped me to be amused and instructed; then we had a stage ride in the suburbs of London, and a row on the Thames twenty miles above London. Here is Huntington, and now too Halstead, who is back from Iceland, and who is going home with me.

It was rather wild to ask you to come up to Boston and see me off — but I felt as if I couldn't well go without it — and your dispatch, which I found on the steamer, was my last and sweetest good-bye.

Chapin proves a very genial old party — very amiable and courteous and submissive; he would be more resting if he were a trifle more inspiring,— but he doesn't lay any very serious burdens on me. He says he never had such a good time in his life,— he certainly never had quite *such* a time as he is getting, with me, and among my rather miscellaneous and Bohemian friends. The best thought of the summer to me is your improved health — it is a long while since you have seemed so nearly well as you did at Sallie's wedding — and I continue to be blessed with good reports of you. Some time you must do this thing — but I fear you would find me "rather slow" for company in it.

To Mr. and Mrs. Hooker.

ROYAL OAK HOTEL,
SEVEN OAKS, KENT, September 9, 1874.

MY DEAR KIDS: Here still and prospering. There is only too little of it. My idea is a year of England — London, Seven Oaks, Torquay,— and a *soupçon* of Paris thrown. I believe this, with the right sort of companionship, would make some-

thing of this dreary old head yet. It rains here nearly all the time, but we manage to drive considerably, to walk some, to lie abed ten hours, to play cards, to eat, and to gossip,— reading the newspapers, but strictly avoiding anything like work or care. Every night at seven we go to the Smalleys' for dinner, and after dinner cards and backgammon till half-past ten, and then home to bed at eleven; breakfast at half-past nine — and so on. Huntington is with Smalley and having an "awful" good time, and is very jolly. . . . It is one prolonged spree of a mild moral type, rather elevating and altogether dissipating. Anyhow, I am having a good time, and bolstering up the general health against the general malady. It is now twelve o'clock. Smalley and Huntington have just come in to go with us to an auction sale of live stock, where we expect to see lots of country people and an English scene. God bless you and good-bye.

Mr. Dawes had now declined reëlection to the House, and was understood to look to succeeding Governor Washburn in the Senate.

To H. L. Dawes.

SPRINGFIELD, October 16, 1874.

I thank you for writing me so fully and frankly. I fancy we do understand each other. And yet, I want to say:

First, that my own criticism, and that of others who go farther with it than I, upon you, is not that you seek to do your work *through* the Republican party, simply, but that, while remaining in the Republican party and working there, you do not give it the benefit of your truest thought and best action. That party, I believe, and they believe, is ready to respond to a good deal that is in your head and heart that you do not utter. We all believe, too, that you would win the objects of your ambition much more easily, much more surely, by a little more candor and courage. If you should chance to fail now — as I trust not, surely — I fully believe it will be because you were not more just, more judicial, and more frank, in dealing with the Southern questions, with the third-term business, and

with the course of the Administration party generally — always within the lines of the party.

Secondly. . . . It is because you make —— powerful to pursue Judge Robinson and demoralize politics in Berkshire. that he hesitates and opposes; and I must confess that I have no reply, certainly no effective reply, to that argument. . . .

You must bear with my frankness, for it is the frankness of genuine friendship.

I don't believe you *are* ignorant why we opposed you last winter and are favoring you now. If you are, I can enlighten you in a few words. Elected then, you would have been Butler's and Simmons's man this year; now you are, I trust, your own.

To Mrs. Hooker.

December 8, 1874.

You are very sweet not to remind me I have not written since I left England. I know it badly enough myself. But I keep holy thought of you — pride in you — anxiety for you; never more, never deeper. . . . Your more constant correspondents tell you all the news. I hardly know where to "dip in" for your instruction and fructification. This last Sunday we had Mr. John Hooker, of Hartford, and Cousin Maria both with us, and we all, I think, had mutually good times out of one another. Mrs. Hooker is still in Paris, and writing letters for print on music, prima donnas, paintings, artists, and fashions. By the way, why don't you write a few letters from Berlin about kindred topics, — its growth, the American colony, the new minister, the University, Bismarck, the controversy with the Catholics, etc.? It will be good practice for you, and please the *Republican* readers — for you have the newspaper gift, you know. . . . The *Republican's* opposition to Mr. Alexander was dreadfully hard business, but there was no help for it. It did not make it more agreeable to me that Mr. Chapin was the rival candidate — I would rather have had somebody on our side with whom I had no personal relations. I inclose you a copy of a letter I sent to Henry the day before he was nominated. I never had any reply to it, — and I have not seen him since the election. . . . But it will all be outgrown in a little while, I hope.

To George W. Smalley.

December 9, 1874.

I have been a long while coming to this letter, but the to-morrows for private letter-writing have not been very thick since I got home the first of October. I found myself quite refreshed by my very lazy and luxurious two months' vacation, but the wear and tear of a daily newspaper and the revolution in politics have brought me back, since, to the old place.

How are you and Mrs. Smalley, and the little Smalleys — from the very old oldest to the wee baby? I suppose you are back in your London home, which Conway has just celebrated in *Harper*,— whether most to your mortification or the envy of American house-owners I am not quite prepared to say. But what could the American world do without Conway! I think we could spare you from London, provided you would come home, but Conway, never. We shall have a bigger than Alabama claim against Great Britain if she sends him back or arrests his pen.

The elections were only a surprise in degree, not in kind. Our people were slow in ripening to the result, but when they came to it they came with a dash. "Father" Chapin's candidacy in this district was a surprise to him and to all of us; his election an easy certainty. It was a little embarrassing to me, because his Republican opponent was my own brother-in-law and a very clever fellow, for whom I would do anything, personally; but he happened to be, also, the king of all our local political rings and debauchments, and there was nothing but to "go for him" sharply. Chapin was, of course, foolish to want to go to Congress at his time of life, and I told him so, but, like many another man who has won his victories in other fields, he hungered and thirsted for just this thing, and now he is as happy as Huntington after a breakfast of bacon and with a dinner of ham in the near prospect.

. . . You can prognosticate as to general politics as well as I. I think the currency question will soon practically break both parties. If Grant is shrewd, he will push it sharply upon both of them, and oblige this Congress to face the music directly, and this failing, call together the new, and give them a turn with its disintegrating influences.

. . . Gaston will do nothing as governor. What we need in Massachusetts is a drastic dose of the Adams family. The whole machinery of our administrative policy needs the revolutionary and reforming hand of men who rather like making other folks unhappy.

I wish I could put in some pleasant gossip for Mrs. Smalley, but the annals of virtuous people, like those I associate with, are very stupid. There has been no new breaking of the commandments, so far as I know, that will interest either of you.

. . . My daughter is comfortably settled in Berlin for the winter, living very quietly and happily. I dream of a year of English country life still, but I fear it will be a dream only, and if you are coming back one of the great temptations for it will be gone. You *did* make it so pleasant last summer that I fear you have spoiled me for any ordinary English life.

To H. L. Dawes.

January 6, 1875.

I suppose you understand affairs at Washington and Boston better than I. I have been shut up most of the time for the last fortnight, and this forbade my seeing you while at home. I am afraid there are enough Republicans in the legislature implacably hostile to you to prevent your election. Yet, you have powerful friends and influences at work. The Washington situation threatens to embarrass and complicate that at Boston. I don't believe it is possible to prevent a revolt against the Administration on the currency bill and Southern policy. If you accept them, I think it must hurt. If you oppose, there is danger in the quarter that you have been of late so overcareful — as it seemed to me — to placate. Yet, looking at it all round, if I were you I should be the first Massachusetts member to oppose the currency bill and Southern policy, as bad statesmanship and worse politics. I should do it within party lines, but I should do it — and most decidedly. I do not believe that the Administration can afford, even if it has the power, to punish men who take this ground.

The Republican party is going to the devil very fast. Nothing can possibly save it, save such men as you coming out and

saying you are not going with it. That may force a halt and reconstruction of policy. At any rate, it will force a new Opposition party in place of the Democracy, and prevent the latter, as at present organized and officered, from taking the country.

I am not so much "on the advice" as I used to be; but I can't help this indulgence!

To his Wife.

WASHINGTON [Spring of 1875].

I am beginning to be pretty well and to enjoy myself. I staid at the Browns' at New York, and met Anna Dickinson and Kate Field at dinner. Last night I dined here with the Schurzes,—they mean to go to Massachusetts to live after leaving Congress this coming spring; to-night Mr. Brown, Joe Hawley, and Mr. Watterson, who is still here, and I dine together at a restaurant; to-morrow Mr. ——, the lobbyist, gives me a dinner party, and I shall meet my old friend Irwin of the Pacific mail; the next night, Wednesday, we dine with Mr. Postmaster-general Jewell, and are to meet the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bristow. The next day we mean to go to Philadelphia, and stay overnight; on Friday to New York, and Saturday home. There is nothing new. My time is all taken up in seeing and talking with people. Last night I slept first-rate, and am feeling better to-day than for some weeks.

His eldest daughter's first child was born while she was in Europe — at a time when Mr. Bowles was under an unusual pressure of cares, from the Phelps libel suit and other matters.

To Mrs. Hooker.

AT MR. BILLINGS'S,

WOODSTOCK, VT., May 27, 1875.

I am late in tendering thanks for my new honors, and in offering congratulations on your advanced glory. But you know my heart is with you, with understanding and sympathy, in these great experiences — and I have been so absorbed and

weary all the season that writing seemed out of the question. I am spending a week here, and am beginning to feel freshness and strength again. Everything seems to have gone on gloriously with you, both in fact and feeling, and there seems nothing to lament, nothing to criticise. I pray you may continue to find as successful answer to your wise care and thoughtful self-control. It is considerable of a thing to be a grandfather — when the posterity is of such a character! — but it is "an almighty big thing" to be a mother! Don't this cover the whole subject, vast as it is in its suggestions and its joys?

There is nothing radically new with me or the family. You get the details from Mother. The great facts are that she and myself are quite as well, perhaps somewhat better, than usual this spring, and seem to have a brighter chance of holding on and keeping well than we have done at occasions in the past. The *Republican* had a big victory in its libel suit. Nothing in its history has more thoroughly vindicated and ennobled it. The expenses of the suit are about $4000, and we can ill afford so much money out of our small profits,—but on general principles it is probably a good investment. Anyhow it was an inevitable one. Mr. Allen was of great help to me in it all; he was a volunteer counsel, but no one did more or better work in the whole matter. . . . I shall be off on little vacations as much as possible during the summer, and in August, after the Babes get back [his usual name for his second daughter and her husband], I may go away for a month or so. But I have wholly given up Europe this year, and do not see how I can go for a long stay any way. If Mother could go over to you for a few weeks or months, I should certainly go with her, or send Sam — but now the baby is so successfully launched, she does not seem to feel the *duty* of it so strongly. I suppose you will be alone when this reaches you, or as much alone as the mother of a first baby can be. I pray everything goes well with you.

To Mrs. Runkle.

June 21, 1875.

No, you must not think hard of me because I can't agree with you that Beecher is innocent. It is an honest, conscientious opinion, not wantonly come to, nor lightly held, and I

must be true to it. I cannot possibly see my way out in any other direction. That some of the utterances of the *Republican* on the subject have been lacking in the true spirit, I must agree with you in thinking. But the main fact of its position I would not shirk if I could, and I could not if I would.

It was a very sweet, restful Sunday that I had with you. I could unravel this tangled head of mine with six months of such life.

General Bartlett was nominated by the Massachusetts Democrats as lieutenant-governor, on the ticket with Governor Gaston; and the following seems to have been in reply to a letter from him.

To General W. F. Bartlett.

October 8, 1875.

It is a very narrow line between accepting and declining, and you must not lay too much stress upon my judgment. If you are ready to identify yourself with the Democratic party, why, I should advise you to accept; if not, not. I am perfectly ready to help the Democracy go up higher, by encouragement, by indorsement of special platforms and special tickets, and sometimes by my vote; but so long as there is reasonable doubt as to its position next year, its candidates and its platforms, so long as a large portion of the party are openly on the wrong side of public questions, and another large portion are ready to compromise, I could not identify myself with the party, or counsel a friend to. If Loring had been nominated [by the Republicans,— who did nominate Rice] the question would have been different. There would have been a large local exigency, commanding a local combination, without reference to national issues or next year's campaign. Now, there is nothing local, and the two parties simply represent each a mere party organization, preparing for a mere party triumph next year.

My own position is that of armed neutrality. It simply seems to me that you will be more consistent with yourself in occupying the same. That is all.

General Bartlett declined the nomination, and on the publication of his letter Mr. Bowles telegraphed to him:

October 10, 1875.

Your letter is perfect. It will not only rescue but elevate you.

The Ohio Republicans won the state election of this year, on the issue of resumption against inflation.

To Murat Halstead.

October 19, 1875.

I salute the Grand Field-marshal, profoundly! It was a big thing, and you, more than all other men, did it. I am very proud of independent journalism in general — of the Cincinnati *Commercial* in particular — and of myself for knowing and liking so well the dear, big, brave boy who edits it! Now pray take thy ease a little, and gather strength for next year.

We really came very near nominating Adams here; if it was to be done over again it would be done. The Republican leaders here capitulate, and offer the united support of the party for him in the national convention. George Curtis says he is the only man the Republicans can elect. Wouldn't it be sweet, in view of "Seventy-two," to have that happen? Everything, however, is chaotic. Meantime, we find Tilden a good man to talk about. He is, after all, the one real person of power in our politics to-day, and it is his name that is driving the Republicans to Adams.

To Charles Allen.

November 25, 1875.

. . . I am glad you like my notice [this probably refers to the obituary of Henry Wilson]; I was afraid you would think it a little overwrought, and not low-toned enough for the subject. There is where I err always in my work; it gives it something of its power and charm with the mass of readers; it loses for it something of the impression on the select and superior few.

To Murat Halstead.

March 4, 1876.

I should have met you in New York; you are more tempting than a woman, especially if she has a sister. Things move, don't they? I begin to think with you that Bristow can't save them. But the stone which the builders rejected in Seventy-two can. The Democrats are going to behave pretty shrewdly, and Adams is the only man that can demoralize them North and South. He will pull the old Whigs out in the South and North, and will cut across party lines as no other man. But they won't take him unless they get terribly scared, or Grant backs him. He is the only man Grant's support wouldn't hurt. Probably you will sniff at these suggestions, but they are worth bearing in mind. Massachusetts would and could make a powerful demonstration for Adams, but for a dozen men here in the state, who fear they would be of less consequence under his administration than under somebody else's.

There is to be a Bristow conference in New York next Wednesday night, mostly local I suppose, but I have been invited. I think I sha'n't go, however. There is too much cigar smoke at such conferences for my head. Still, it is the best thing to do,— to organize for Bristow, and put in the best licks for him along the line. Blaine won't do; he hasn't the spirit of reform, and there are too many Marshes in the country who can destroy him, I fear.

I have been living on milk a good deal this winter. It helps my head and fattens my body, and I have done some days' works that would be no discredit to you even — two and three columns at a time. But it's dangerous business.

How is Watterson getting on in his new building? I don't see any perfecting press doing so good work as yours. It brings out small type better than any of the rest of them. But minion is as small as you ought to use for reading-matter.

Father Chapin will pull through, I think, but they are making an awful clamor against him now [the Ware River transaction being under legislative investigation]. He is altogether too rich, and things do look so different now from what they did two years ago [*i. e.*, values have altered within the time

since the lease was made] — that's the trouble. I take some comfort, after having been for years on the unpopular side in abusing people, in being on the unpopular side in defending some one.

To Frank B. Sanborn.

March 17, 1876.

I am very glad, and grateful too, that you have been able to do so much justice and give so much attention to Robinson ["Warrington"] and his memory, this week. It was a great trial to me that I could not be at Malden and Concord. I was in Boston Saturday and Sunday to attend a newspaper meeting, but my head has been so bad the last ten days that I could and did go nowhere else, and remained shut up in the house, and did not hear of his death until Saturday evening,— too late to see you, as I should have tried to do. The fact is, I have had to make the choice between neglecting altogether the paper or everything else. I am too much wounded to do two things, and the paper seems to demand the first place, both on public and private accounts. I can only trust that my friends will discover this, and be more generous to me than I am obliged to seem to be to them because of it. It is a great comfort to all of us who have really known Robinson, to see the just appreciation and rich tribute which his death calls out now from all quarters.

To H. L. Dawes.

May 22, 1876.

Ah, my dear Dawes, if you only would "let us alone!" More or less interference! There would be no trouble in this district in sending first-class delegates to Cincinnati, in sympathy with the rest of Massachusetts, but for your office-holders — some of them forced upon the district against its will — and the men who control and direct. It is the inspiration and leadership coming down from you through certain channels that is degrading and weakening the party in this district, making it a hindrance rather than a help to reform, and threatening just now to misrepresent the party and the district at Cincinnati, to cheapen its power, and make it almost an exception among the

districts of Massachusetts. My point is simply, that as long as these men are allowed to misrepresent you and exercise your power in the district, they should have at least the hint that it is to be well exercised. I have no motives in finding fault in this matter, save my hopes of the Republican party, my personal local pride, my regard for your political future, and my desire to have everything in all parties of the best. Selfishly viewed, this local degradation and perversion of the party machine is only strengthening and magnifying the *Republican* and myself, and making it very easy for the district to be swept permanently out of the hands of the Republican party. Remember, you said in so many words two years ago that you were going with our sort of fellows in Massachusetts; yet if not under your direct influence, indirectly by it, and in your name, your district is lagging behind all the rest of the state, and the only record you have made during this campaign, so far,— the record of an interviewer,— is against all this reform uprising, which has been so auspicious in the commonwealth, and which promises so much, except in your own district, for the future of the Republican party of Massachusetts.

To his Wife, in Blandford.

Saratoga Springs, August 7, 1876.

I have been rather poorly with dyspepsia and its pains since I came over Friday, but am better to-day. I have met a distinguished doctor here from Cincinnati, Bartholo,— like Dr. Smith, only more thorough and scholarly,— and am going to try his theory of my troubles and their cure. The theory is not very different from the others', but he is more exact and simple in his definitions. His treatment is dieting altogether — no medicine — he wants me to begin by living for a few weeks on milk exclusively — a gill every three hours — then a choice diet which he is to prescribe. He doesn't want me to stop work. I am so impressed with his ability, and he is so positive that Tom's trouble cannot be what Dr. Smith says it is, that I am going back to Springfield to-morrow with him, on his way to Newport, for the purpose of having him see Tom and con-

sult with Dr. Smith about the case. My present purpose is to return here the next day. I have already begun the gill of milk every three hours, and nothing else. It is not satisfying for the price, and I expect to get ferocious.

SPRINGFIELD, August 9, 1876.

I have finished two days of my milk diet. I am relieved of some of my ailments — but I am "powerful weak," and unequal to any labor. In a day or two I am to have a cracker — then soon an egg — on slowly to broths, and finally to meat, fruit, and vegetables. It is an intelligent experiment, and, since there seem to be new necessities for living and working, altogether worth my faithful trying.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, August 14, 1876.

I wish I was on the Blandford hill with you and the infants this birthday of yours. But I am not and can't be. It is hot here, and I am not very lively. Still, my experiment in the art of living and getting well seems reasonably hopeful. I do not grow weak,— on the contrary I believe I feel stronger and better than I did. I eat now a little bread or cracker twice a day, and drink about three pints of milk in the twenty-four hours. It is all I want of that — and the hunger for food is singularly controllable. I should like it — but it is not unbearable to go without it.

Tom will tell you about life here. It is pretty gay for those who have a taste and a power in that direction. For invalids and milk-drinkers — why, it gives amusement to look on.

I pray you continue to get strength. I hope you will feel able and willing to stay in Blandford far into if not through September. I shall have just the leisure and strength for housekeeping when I get back, and will put things straight there.

I do not know what to do about the Centennial. I want you and the children to go a good deal more than I want to go myself. Indeed, I am hoping some way to escape it for myself.

To General W. F. Bartlett.

September 6, 1876.

Thanks for your very kind note. We have been abused enough by Republicans because of that article to make any praise of it agreeable. And your approval is always very grateful. It is a narrow line that divides us as to the Presidency. Whichever is elected, we shall have better government, but I am confident that all in all it will be easier and more complete with Hayes. And there will be a hard fight either way with the rascals and the idiots.

You and your sickness have been on my mind a good deal all summer. I meant to have been in Pittsfield long ago to see you, and, extraordinaries excepted, I shall go either this next Saturday or some day next week. But, with the exception of a fortnight at Saratoga, I have been very closely followed by care all the season, and have not been away from home even for a day.

I hope to-day will realize the promise of last night at Worcester. [This refers to the Democratic state convention, at which C. F. Adams was nominated for governor.] If so, we shall have a revolution, in Massachusetts at least. I was most agreeably surprised to find so many of the Democratic leaders so earnestly for Adams.

Of course you would be brave under your afflictions. I pray they may be brief, and that your body may yet answer once more to your spirit.

To Colonel Robert Pomeroy, after the death of General Bartlett.

December 18, 1876.

My dear old Boy: So it is over. I return the slips, and one or two others, which I presume you have, however.

I couldn't quite say all I feel of Bartlett in print. You must carry your audience with you, and not many of mine knew him as I did. In a public sense he was the greatest comfort I had, because so long as there are such men no one could justly despair of the republic. I believe there will be, now, inspiration and strength from his grave, and that, dying, he may

seem even to wield an influence that, living, had been denied him.

To you all, and especially to her and to them — the wife and mother and children — my tenderest sympathy goes and abides.

To Senator Newton Booth.

December 8, 1876.

. . . I think you made more out of the campaign, and lost less, than any other man. Your speeches were the best — of the sort — and you seem to have fully reconquered your position in the party every way. I pray you use it wisely! We are at the final forks of the roads. We shall come through — no doubt of that. But it is the final break-down of the Republican party. And I have got through shedding tears over that prospect. Once the Democratic party was the great obstacle to reform politics; now the Republican machine blocks the way.

I took out a patent, long ago, for the Ten Commandments as a party platform. But thinking of your possible infirmities, I have reduced it to two planks — first, Thou shalt not lie; second, Thou shalt not steal. Is yours better than this? Certainly we can make no machine work that doesn't have some moral principle below and behind it in the people who run it.

To George W. Smalley.

January 18, 1877.

It is almost compensation for having you in England, — the pleasure of reading your letters. There are a good many of us who suspend our profanity on the *Tribune* at large, when we come to the special London correspondence.

There isn't anything especially new. I am getting through the winter personally pretty well — with a good deal of headache and nervous dyspepsia and bleeding of the nose, — but still gaining flesh, doing my work easier, and, I think, in a sweeter frame of mind generally. Perhaps this is partly because the *Republican* is recognized as having made the place for itself

that it has sought to make, that it is receiving a great deal of commendation and many new subscriptions from the best sort of folk all over the country, and that, in spite of hard times and very dull advertising, it starts off the year with an improved business and a small margin over expenses. Ah me, what an opportunity the *Tribune* has missed! I believe I feel sadder and crosser over that than I do comfortable over the *Republican's* advantage. Indeed, the latter owes its place to the neglect of the opportunity by the others more than to any real virtue and power of its own.

As to politics, you see all there is. Yet there is a good deal to be *felt*. I think I never saw the subtle, unexpressed thought of the American people in one or two directions so influential, so permeating the mind of the country. It is very odd that it doesn't get more expression; but the fact is, the thinking is in different directions, and to a certain extent contradicts and neutralizes itself — one thought being that Tilden is, on the whole, fairly elected, and the other, the old deep distrust of him and of the Democratic party. It is impossible to get up any excitement. The Democratic efforts to arouse the masses are a ridiculous failure The business men won't speak out, and while everybody is keeping up a devil of a thinking and talks freely in private, there isn't any public utterance save through the daily newspapers and the cheaper sort of politicians. I think the community can be fairly divided into about three equal classes — one, that is cocksure Tilden is elected and ought to be inaugurated, anyhow; another, that Hayes is ditto, ditto; and the third, that doesn't care which is President, really, if only his path to the place be peaceful and supported by more authority than he has yet got. But the majority of this third class believe that Tilden is entitled to the Louisiana vote, though rather wishing that he wasn't.

If Hayes is President, I am not quite so hopeful as I was of the best set of men going into his cabinet. The other set got scared two or three weeks ago, and I am afraid made him give bonds on the subject. Still, he will have to shake off the rascals pretty sharply. If Tilden has the chance, he will certainly appoint Adams secretary of state, and I think a Hayes

Republican also to his cabinet—I hope Hayes himself. He has got to break with the worst elements of his party, and I fancy nobody sees this or accepts it more fully than himself.

We have unexpectedly beaten Boutwell here, and shall probably elect Hoar — possibly only Bullock — instead.

To Senator Booth.

January, 1877.

. . . You see the *Republican* was the first to suggest the Supreme Court [as arbitrator of the disputed Presidency], and got no end of kicks for it. Wasn't it in newspaper human nature to say, "I told you so," when great men like you, from "the most magnificent country of the world, by G——, sir!"—in the presence of whose magnificent nature, stealing a railroad and robbing a bank and walloping the Chinese rise to Christian virtues,—adopted it? You must pardon something to human vanity, even in the rural districts and in the winter time with the thermometer below zero.

. . . You seem to hold violent views of Tilden. He is a good deal better than his party, and will prove so if he has a chance. That isn't saying much, I agree.

Remember that the *Republican* is trying to make a newspaper, and not running a party nor even counting the votes. But if any of you fellows can invent a better general scheme than this, I beg you to try your hands. I am getting to feel supreme indifference which man you count in. All I ask and all the country asks now really is that you do it in a way that will stand fire, not simply of the barbaric hordes from the Maumee, but the moral fire of history.

CHAPTER XLVII.

A Glance at the "Republican."

THE end of the story is almost reached. Let us glance back over some of the features of the man's life which have been neglected while we were following the course of events.

The contents of the many volumes of the Daily *Republican*, for the period of thirty-three years in which Mr. Bowles was its editor, represent the work of many hands besides his, but it is hardly an exaggeration to say that every page shows his inspiration. There is no way of adequately describing the quality of the newspaper to one who has not seen it, any more than a character or a face can be reproduced in words. No biography is reckoned complete without a portrait of its subject; and the biography of an editor must fall short of perfection so long as it does not include an exact reproduction of one issue of his newspaper.

The reading-matter of one number of the *Republican* in its later years would make about seventy-five pages like this one. The first impression the paper makes is of a handsome face; the letter being a clear and open one; the only type, minion, except a very sparing use of nonpareil. Of the eight pages, one is devoted mainly to editorials; the larger part of another to telegraphic dis-

patches; the Springfield and New England news occupies a third; and correspondence, book reviews, selections, etc., are distributed among the advertising pages. The professional journalist notes at once the orderly arrangement of each department, the clearness and condensation of the news, the good taste in all matters of form, the thoroughness of editing. Judged as a newspaper, perhaps the most striking quality is the evenness of the work. Nothing is slighted. The item in some out-of-the-way corner about a murder on a Texas ranch is as good a piece of workmanship of its kind as the editorial. Taking an average number of the paper during the last half-dozen years of Mr. Bowles's life, the editorial page has first some two columns of paragraphs, from twelve to twenty in all,— news, comment, jest,— attractive and appetizing, yet with conviction and purpose running through all. Then follow usually three or four longer discussions, from a quarter to a full column or over in length; and then another column of "Note and Comment"— items of one or two pithy sentences each. No style of newspaper writing is more liable to abuse than the paragraphic. To so shape the paragraph as to combine brevity and pungency with fairness of statement and solid sense is an extremely difficult art, and in this art Mr. Bowles was a master.

The department of New England news is an instance of good arrangement. First, under small heads, are given the prominent events of the past twenty-four hours in Springfield; then comes a column or two of minor city items; then follows each of the closely neighboring towns; then each of the western counties by itself; next, eastern Massachusetts; then, separately, the other New England states. The arrangement seems simple and obvious enough, but such things make a part of the difference between a well-edited newspaper and one

"put together with a pitchfork," as some of the most pretentious newspapers continue to be.

Among the early surprises of the novice in the *Republican* office,—often just graduated from college,—was the discovery that writing editorials is but a small part of the journalist's business, and that a great many other things must first be learned. He found that the writing of a news item ranks among the fine arts. To give the facts of a trifling incident with accuracy, clearness, brevity, and readableness is no small achievement. Said Mr. Bowles to one of his pupils: "Don't suppose that any one will read through six lines of bad rhetoric to get a crumb of news at the end." Another of his directions was: "Never begin a news item by giving the time and place — that fails to attract the reader's attention." To a bright beginner of a few months' standing he said: "E——, when will you be able to make a good item? There's G—— has been here two years, and is just learning to do it." In every part of the paper he pruned away verbiage remorselessly — no matter if it was in a costly telegraphic dispatch. He used to tell his young men, in writing an editorial: "Put it all in the first sentence."

A zest and sparkle ran through every part of the paper. Mr. Bowles's principle was, "Make every department such that everybody will want to read it." Sometimes the drollest paragraph would be in a column of religious news. A touch of poetry might be found in a city item. The spirit the chief inspired in all his workers recalled Opie's reply to the young painter who asked him what he mixed his colors with: "With brains, sir!" His art as journalist was too fine to be expressed in any set of formulas. "The style is the man." His universal interest in humanity, in literature, in nature; the epigrammatic character of his thought;

the humor, the audacity, the common sense; — these qualities impregnated the whole paper. "It is the only paper I ever care to read *through*," said a woman. Its editor knew how to make politics interesting to women and millinery interesting to men.

In the general tone of the *Republican* the quality which was most widely blamed in its later years was its censoriousness. As to this the fundamental truth was that Mr. Bowles was an idealist living in a very imperfect world; that he had a keen eye and a bold temper; and that he saw public life full of shortcomings, the press full of apologists, and the community often absorbed and apathetic. The public, which puts an exaggerated value on good nature, did not fully appreciate the service his sharp truth-speaking did it. He might have borrowed the words of Socrates in his Defense: "I am a sort of gadfly given to the state by the gods; and the state is like a great and noble steed, who is tardy in his motions owing to his very size, and requires to be stirred into life; and all day long and in all places I am always fastening upon you, arousing and persuading and reproaching you." What heightened the need of such sharp criticism was that the great majority of newspapers were by their partisan character professional defenders of their party friends. It was said of the *Republican* that it assumed the office not of judge but of prosecuting attorney. The partial truth in the allegation had for its set-off the fact that most of its contemporaries took the office — as far as regarded members of their own party — of attorneys for the defense. In such a situation there is forced on the independent journalist an undue share of the work of fault-finding.

Yet undeniably Mr. Bowles sometimes overdid the part of censor. From choice and habit, the *Republican* gave the combative method too great a preference over

the conciliatory. Something of this was due to the exigencies of making every day a readable and piquant sheet. It kept its readers always on the alert, always interested, but in entertaining them it sacrificed something of the power to win and lead them. Mr. Bowles's sharp and pungent quality imparted itself to his assistants, and sometimes in them it degenerated into rudeness,— the rapier became a bludgeon.

A friend once wrote to him in a private letter:

"It seems to me that a newspaper should be governed by the same principles which a gentleman follows in his personal conduct. For instance, a gentleman does not consider it a point of honor to never make or own a mistake. His point of honor is when he does make a mistake to frankly acknowledge and repair it. Why should not a newspaper do the same?"

Mr. Bowles in reply asked for permission to print the letter, saying he should like to discuss the questions it raised. The permission was given, but the article was never written — crowded out probably by the press of other matters. It would have been most interesting to see his treatment of the subject. In one of the obituary notices of him the criticism was made, that he held that a journalist had necessarily a code for his professional conduct which sometimes required him to do things that in his private capacity he would not do. One fancies that if he knew of this censure, he would have been glad to come back from any other sphere long enough to make his defense. But no one can say just what that defense would have been. In a sense it is unquestionably true that a man's official position may call on him for a different line of action from that which he would follow in a private capacity. The great law, "Thou shalt not kill," is set aside by the soldier when he strikes down his foe in the field. The judge before whom a criminal

is convicted, were he free to follow his personal judgment, might sometimes say, "Go, and sin no more,"— but his official position allows him only to mete out punishment. Every profession has necessarily and rightly its own special code of ethics,— based on certain fundamental and universal principles, but applying them according to its peculiar conditions. To rightly determine what are the true moral standards of any vocation is a high and often difficult task. To discuss all the topics of newspaper morality would be a very large undertaking. But there are certain aspects of the subject which we may well go on to consider in view of the work of such a journalist as Samuel Bowles.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

The Ethics of News-giving.

"LET a man only tell you his story every morning and evening, and at the end of a twelvemonth he will have become your master." So said Burke of the newspaper when it was in its infancy. To-day the American paper puts every morning a volume of fresh reading into every household in the land,—a volume which is caught up and eagerly scanned while still damp from the press. What does this unceasing talker, which has every man's ear, talk about? On the morning when these lines are written, the Springfield *Republican*, in its telegraphic columns, tells what delegates were chosen yesterday to select the presidential candidate for 1884; what Congress did about the tariff; what the French premier said about his government's foreign policy; what transpired as to Gordon's position in the Soudan, and as to the opening of the Congo country to civilization. It describes a Wagner concert in Boston last night, and gives the scores of half a dozen base-ball games. It reports the inquiry as to the ice-crushed "Jeannette," and that regarding the Star-route frauds; and briefly mentions fifty events all over the world,—the beginning of a new ocean cable from Nova Scotia, the trial of the sheriff of New York for extortion, the death of the Duke of Buccleuch, the drowning of sixteen Aberdeen fisher-

men, the Emperor William's catarrh, the statement of the Dominion's finance minister, the discovery of new gold fields in the North-west, a strike of miners in Pennsylvania, and so on. On another page are given more than two hundred items of New England news,— accidents, crimes, clerical installations, church fairs, real estate sales, lawsuits, business enterprises, notable deaths, and the like. On the editorial page there are twenty paragraphic comments on the politics and general news of the day; a description of a great reform initiated in the government of New York City; an article in deprecation of the too narrow basis on which a Young Men's Christian Association has begun in Springfield, and in advocacy of a more catholic and effective enterprise; and a discussion of the tariff question as entitled to a more unpartisan treatment than Congress is giving to it. Other pages contain the report of a remarkable will case in Northampton, a letter on art and society in New York, two columns of the legislature's doings in Boston, the report of yesterday's money market, and twenty columns of business advertisements. That is the paper's story for one day. An equally wide range it covers three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. It goes daily to ten or twelve thousand subscribers, and weekly to perhaps as many more; it is seen by a much larger number of readers. What the *Republican* does in its field, other papers are doing each in its own way elsewhere. Hardly an intelligent household but is reached every day by one or more of the many-tongued messengers. They fill our ears with their story, it is through them that we see the world, and they become as Burke said, "our masters."

It may be said that this mastery has not its origin in an independent and sovereign will. The journalist does not tell us whatever he pleases, but merely reports things as

they happen; he is but a photographer of the passing landscapes of each day. But even in this view — which is only partially true, and is limited to one of the two sides of the journalist's work — the fact which marks him as not an autocrat, but a strictly limited agent, yet magnifies the greatness of his vocation and the solidity of its power. In our day, the authority which is superseding all others is the Appeal to Fact. The modern movement of the human mind is the effort to directly observe and faithfully interpret the actual working of the universe. The journalist, simply in telling us the actual story of what is happening in the world of men around us from day to day, wields over us the incomparable power which belongs to reality.

As to how far that power is beneficial to the community, and how far injurious, it is alike easy and dangerous to generalize. The flood of information which the daily journal pours upon its readers has food for every highest and lowest taste of the human mind. In the same number of the *Republican*, one page relates the exhumation of the body of an Arctic explorer, in search of evidence of cannibalism, and another page publishes the tribute of Mozoomdar to Emerson,— the reformer of the East to the seer of the West. The world's news is like the world itself— there is in it the material out of which man may assimilate himself to the angel or to the brute. Most journals rise to no higher stand-point than the average of the society about them. A glance over the first twenty newspapers that come to hand is likely to leave one oppressed with a sense of materialism and superficiality. Newspapers, in a word, for the most part only reflect the general spirit of the community. Shakespeare's portrayal of the drama applies more closely in our day to the newspaper; its end is "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue

her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure."

The great advances in the newspaper art are made by the men who discover what people care most to hear about. Journalists as much as any other class tend to routine and conventional ruts. For example, it is an accepted tradition of journalism that the foremost topic must be politics; and politics it accordingly is on almost every page. But here and there a bright editor perceives that a large part of his constituents care more for something else than they do for politics. He tells his subordinates, for instance: "In most houses where this paper goes, for one person who is interested in politics, there are two who are interested in religion." And he takes constant care to supply the demand. "Have a full report from Cincinnati of the Presbyterian debate on Catholic baptism,—if the Associated Press doesn't give it, order specials." "Find out what Moody is doing." "Send a reporter to all the Episcopal ministers in town to learn what they think about the revision of the prayer-book"—and so on. Or, he learns that his constituency is interested in stock speculation, and accordingly he works up that subject. In either of these cases, it is only a repetition of the elder Bennett's discovery. It was he who began in 1839 to give in the *Herald* the reports of the great religious anniversary meetings in New York,—at first against the protests of the clergy and the church press,— while at the same time he was winning his greatest success by accurate reports of the doings of Wall street. Since then the reporter has laid many another province under contribution,— and there are yet untrodden fields for him to explore, nearer home than the North Pole or the Congo.

A common resource of large newspapers, especially in the West, is to throw out an immense drag-net, sweep in

all possible news of every description, and crowd it uncondensed and unassorted into a mammoth and multiple sheet. The supposition is that in so great a variety each reader will find something to his special taste. But the real want of the average reader is a bird's-eye glance over all that is best worth knowing. The editor who does not know how to select, condense, arrange, and flavor, so as to make the whole of his paper tempting to the reader of average intelligence, has not reached high art. The ideal journalist must first comprehend the general tastes and needs of his audience; next, he must have an unsleeping eye and unerring instinct for the most important points in the world's field of action as it shifts from day to day; and finally, he must know how to present the whole to the reader in due proportion and attractiveness. It was in the degree in which he possessed this combination that Bowles was unique among the editors of his generation.

The question as to the moral responsibility of the journalist to the community raises a distinction between the two elements of his work. So far as he undertakes to impart his own opinions and persuade his readers, he comes under the same general obligation as any other public teacher,—to speak sincerely, carefully, and with regard only for the general good. But the primary function of the modern newspaper is not to give its conductors' opinions, or to persuade, but to tell the news. To appreciate the obligations of the news-giver to society we must consider the mercantile as well as the ethical aspect of his business. On the one side it is said with entire truth: "In telling the news and selling it, the editor is in the position of the merchant selling any other kind of goods. His business is to give the sort of news his customers want. He is not carrying on a missionary enterprise; he is a dealer in the market. He is not to be

held responsible in detail for the good or bad use to which his wares may be put. A provision-dealer may believe that a purchaser is buying the means for over-eating and dyspepsia, but he is not on that account to refuse to sell to him. A book-seller does not decline to furnish a trashy novel because he thinks it likely to do the buyer more harm than good. A druggist does not ask whether a patient is being overdosed or unwisely dosed before he supplies a prescribed medicine. Nor is this due merely to the selfishness of trade. It is the proper concession to the liberty of the individual. The necessary restraint upon it is afforded by the authority of society, which puts up safeguards at points of obvious danger,— as by enactments that no one shall sell poisons except with proper precautions, or shall make any sale whatever of adulterated food or of obscene books. In the same way the law forbids the newspaper to injure private reputation by libel, or to poison the public morality by indecency. Within these limits, not only legally but morally the journalist should be held as free as any other trader to suit his wares to his customers' tastes."

This is a just statement, but it covers only half the ground. This, also, is true: Power is a trust. The man who "becomes the master of his readers," is responsible to God and the community for the just and beneficent use of his mastery,—as much so as priest or president. There are obligations beyond those of the statute-books. Neither merchant nor editor is responsible for incidental and unavoidable mischiefs, but each is accountable that his work shall in its broad results be not noxious but wholesome. The journalist's vocation has its special obligations. He is bound to tell the news truly and fairly. He should avoid needless injury of any man. And just so far as he has liberty of choice, he ought to

minister to the higher rather than the lower tastes of his readers. The large outcome of his work is to be ennobling and not depraving.

The first obligation — to be true and fair — hardly needs illustration here beyond what the previous history has afforded. The second principle — the avoidance of needless injury — raises some complicated questions. There is a good deal of news of various kinds, of which the effect may be injurious, either to individuals or to the public, and how far the newspaper ought to exclude such is by no means a simple or easy inquiry.

There is one class of news which the moralist sometimes longs to blot out — the record of crimes and shames. Be the influence of that record bad or good, the journalist cannot omit it. It is part of that history of a day which he is bound to give. Nor in some respects is it desirable that it should be blotted out. It is the parallel in the volume of fact to the dark chapter headed Sin in the volume of philosophy. It grimly confronts the man of moral purpose with the foes he has to face. But also the newspaper's record gives inevitably the general face of humanity in a somewhat distorted aspect, and unduly magnifies the evil elements. The necessity for this is that gross wrong-doing is a conspicuous event, a matter of news, while virtue for the most part, because fortunately it is the common rule, requires no mention. If one cashier embezzles, it demands a paragraph; but the life-long honesty of a thousand cashiers calls for no public notice. Thus, under the most scrupulous editing, there will be some undue prominence of the base side of human action. Yet there is large room for discretion as to how great that prominence shall be. The editor can give the conspicuous place, the blazoning head-lines, and the full detail, to the record of murders and brutalities and

adulteries, or he can remand them to such subordination as they merit, and give conspicuity to themes worthier and not less interesting. As these words are written, there lies at hand a recent number of the *Republican*, in which the first column of telegraphic news is occupied by the report of a conference of "charities and corrections"; and the synopsis of a paper on the Elmira reformatory contains this statement: "Mr. Brockway, the superintendent, recently told me that he had lately begun to doubt whether there are any incorrigibles." Such an item seems quite as valuable a piece of news as the narrative of a murder or a prize-fight.

In regard to offenses directed against the public itself,— the derelictions of its official servants, or invasion of the common rights,— the newspaper's function of watchfulness and exposure is a high duty. In regard to another class of misdeeds, which become public through the operations of the law and the courts, or in other ways are matters of open notoriety, the newspaper has clearly no option but to chronicle the facts. There are other cases of wrong-doing as to which it rests with the journalist to decide whether the world shall know of them or not; and there may be question between the curiosity of the public and the rights of individuals.

The *Republican* (May 5, 1876) discussed the principles applicable to such cases, as follows:

"We quite agree that it is no part of a newspaper's legitimate business to go around digging for social scandals. Even when scandals of this sort come to its knowledge unsought, it is not necessarily either its duty or its right to spread them before the public. As a matter of fact, the *Republican* suppresses half a dozen such scandalous stories where it prints one; and the same is true of every other respectable newspaper in the country." It is impossible, it continues, to lay down an absolute rule; but "no newspaper has the right to

print scandal,—by which we here mean a true statement of facts from which private reputations will suffer,—for scandal's sake, to make its columns 'spicy,' or to gratify private malice whether in or out of the office." Such publication, it says, is justifiable, first, when the offense is public and flagrant, the common talk; it is then a part of the news of the day, and as such the newspaper must give it. Or, again, the interest of public morals may require publicity. "The public journal is bound to take care, as far as it can, that the public interest sustains no detriment. This duty is not less obligatory than the other of printing the news." And further, the newspaper is morally bound to extreme care that its facts be facts. It is obliged to accept news at second-hand from other respectable papers; but its original news must be fully substantiated before publication. As to matters of scandal it must not even rely on the allegations of its own correspondents; "the evidence should be *in the office* before the charge goes into the paper,"—and this, adds the *Republican*, is now the rule and practice of the leading newspapers in the country.

It would be difficult to quarrel with the principles thus laid down. It would be too much to claim that the *Republican* came always fully up to its own ideal, but its aim and general practice are here fairly stated. As to its care not to bring unproved charges, the best evidence is the record of its libel suits. The law of Massachusetts is severe and jealous in guarding the citizen against newspaper libel; yet in the first twenty years following the establishment of the Daily but one libel suit against the *Republican* was brought to trial. This happened in its first decade,—the paper won the verdict and was fully vindicated. The next suit tried against it was the noted one of Willis Phelps, in 1875, where the paper's censure related to a matter of high public concern, and where a nominal decision for the plaintiff left the moral advantage wholly with the defendant. In a subsequent case a physician, whom the paper had charged with a gross and aggra-

vated offense, obtained from a jury damages of one dollar, on the ground that one of the specifications against him came short of absolute proof by the evidence before the court. Another suit, and the only other one brought in Mr. Bowles's life-time,— it was not tried till after his death,— was the case of a clergyman circumstantially charged with gross abuse of his family. The charges were widely bruited and believed in the community; the suit was tried in a remote part of the state; and a verdict of a thousand dollars was given against the newspaper; but its course certainly lost it no favor with the intelligent public. Such a record for a daily journal during a third of a century is an ample vindication of its respect for the rights of private character.

The principles defined above with special regard to scandals affecting private reputations were essentially the same which governed the *Republican* in regard to men in public life. One notable instance of this may be given in the words of a private secretary of Mr. Bowles:

"Several months before the exposure in Congress of Mr. Blaine's transactions in Little Rock securities, Mr. Bowles received a telegram stating that the matter was to be brought before the public. I saw that he was agitated by the news. He had known something of the story before. He at once dictated to me several telegrams to leading journalists and politicians, urging that there should be no publication. The next day he followed up these dispatches by letters to the same effect. He took the ground that as Mr. Blaine was not a candidate before the people for any office, the publication of such scandals was illegitimate, and was attributable either to malice or to a false idea of news. In effect, the matter was kept quiet for some time longer, until, when Blaine was seeking the Republican nomination, it was brought up in Congress."

This was the case of a man to whom the *Republican* was politically unfavorable. When a scandal touching

public men had once taken air, the paper held that the press was bound to probe it to the bottom; but it was opposed to giving publicity in the first instance to any such topic, unless it was requisite to the exclusion of an unfit man from public station, or demanded by other grave necessity.

There is a different question as to the degree of detail in which instances of gross vice should be reported when some mention of them is necessary. In this particular the *Republican* occasionally came under censure among the better class of its constituents. They complained that from the high level of its pages there was sometimes a lapse into offensive particulars of criminal actions. It defended itself with spirit, on the ground that it published only what belonged to the news of the day, what was necessary for the exposure of evil-doers, and what the public demanded. Thus, it said (January 4, 1864):

"A correspondent complains, as a gross inconsistency, and of baleful influence, that the press, while denouncing the prize-fight, prints the full details. So it prints robberies and murders, and denounces the crimes. So it records the unchristian controversies of Christian men and women, and disapproves of them. So it tells you the mercury was down below zero yesterday morning, yet shrugs its shoulders at it. When will all good people be intelligent enough to comprehend and yield the fact that the daily newspaper is but a 'map of busy life'— having its shadows as well as its lights — its crimes as well as its beneficences — its shames as well as its glories; and that the paper that does not do this, however useful and pleasant in Sunday-schools, however valuable as a moral or religious agent, is no newspaper, and must ever be limited in range and influence — limited indeed to those who need it least?"

The subject is one as to which there is not much room for disagreement upon general principles. The duty of the paper to give the news is clearly subject to certain

general limitations of decency. An illustrated paper tells the news by pictures; but to tell some kinds of criminal news in that way would very properly bring the editor into the police court; and the same principle holds good morally as to description by language. There are details which are necessary in the court-room or the medical lecture-room, which are shocking to modesty and injurious to the community when spread before the general public in a newspaper. It is an essential part of good editing to eliminate from all news the irrelevant detail; and in deciding what is irrelevant the editor is bound to consult not only the taste of various classes of readers, but also good taste and morals. The removal of a cancer, the occurrence of a prize-fight, or a case of adultery, may become legitimate matter of news, but in either instance the public is entitled to be spared the minute details. These principles are indisputable: there is only question of their application to particular cases. As to the actual practice of the *Republican*, it must be said that it certainly allowed itself a freer license in narrating offensive crimes than was approved of by the better class of its readers. Mr. Bowles was not solely responsible, yet it was a matter which he could have controlled, as he did when he chose control everything in the office. There was a perceptible amendment in later years, after some changes in the staff.

But if, in its passion for giving all the news, the *Republican* sometimes overstepped the line in one direction, its general practice was to gratify and stimulate the higher tastes of its readers. To the charm of its news, vivacity, and sincerity, it added that of a constant attention to the nobler interests of life. It told matters which are worth telling,— matters which the men and women of large minds and generous hearts care to know about. This book has followed the thread of its political

discussions only. Politics was its leading topic, but its range covered a thousand interests which cannot be glanced at here. All forms of social progress belonged to its field. The advancement of women was one of its most frequent themes. As to the methods of public charity, prisons, reformatories, and hospitals, it gave for twenty years more valuable information probably than any other paper in the country, except perhaps the New York *Times*. Its literary criticisms were notable for thoroughness, sincerity, and discrimination. Its habit was to occasionally devote three or four columns to some new book of importance. Its judgments on all subjects were singularly free from provincial narrowness. Upon literature and kindred topics it showed a culture which few of the metropolitan journals could rival, and still fewer of them equaled it in freedom from partisanship and the influence of cliques.

In many ways it bore the stamp of its locality. To the scenery of rural New England it gave constant and loving recognition. Mr. Bowles's appreciation of nature found eloquent expression in his letters of travel, although at home his pen rarely touched on that theme. But among the staff of the paper there was always some one who gave voice to a love for the earth's face like the love of a child for its mother. From the files of the *Republican*, through twenty years, there could be gleaned a volume of charming prose idyls of New England. The editorial style of the paper, upon whatever subject, often smacked racily of the soil. The vigorous vernacular, the pithy phrase of the Yankee farmer, gave zest and snap to many a paragraph. In the paper's language, as in its sympathies, it made itself one with the common people.

Newspapers are prosaic. The news of the day, as it must for the most part be told, gives little expression to romance or ideality. Hardly any newspaper can stand

the test of being taken as a companion into a garden on a dewy June morning. The traveler in Europe, while he is amid the spells of cathedrals and picture galleries and scenes made memorable by a wonderful past, is likely to find his American paper a reminder of a somewhat sordid and materialistic world. In either situation hardly any other newspaper relished so well as the *Republican*. There was apt to be in it a touch of nature with which the June roses would not disown fellowship. It spoke the voice of an ideal America, which stirred the heart amid Europe's ancient grandeurs with the sense of a heroic present.

The functions of news-giving and of guiding opinion are in a logical sense to be distinguished from each other, but in a well-edited paper the two elements are closely interwrought. This was the case in an especial degree with the *Republican*. The news element was conspicuous in every department. In some journals the editorial page is little more than a series of essays, and so far as they are based on news the reader must go to another page for its statement. But Mr. Bowles recognized no higher or more constant function for the editorial writer than to give the reader new facts. He knew well that for guiding opinion the incomparable method is to give the reader facts which make their own plea. "Gentlemen of the jury," said Webster on one occasion, "I shall make no argument in this case,—I shall simply state the facts"; and the statement which followed was weightier than any argument. The *Republican's* news dispatches, in turn, were edited by careful hands. The reports of "Associated Press" or special correspondents received supplement or correction, as they might need, and went to the reader with obscurities cleared away, explanations interwoven, and verbiage cut out.

The style of the elegant essayist or the philosophic historian is not a more distinct product of art, and hardly a finer product, than a first-class newspaper style. The aim is different, the conditions are different, but the skill with which the journalist weaves his material into compact, incisive, telling narrative,—working, as he must, in hot haste; aiming, too, to meet the needs of a hurrying reader, whose glancing mind he must hit as the sportsman hits the bird on the wing,—this is as admirable in its way as the performance of the leisurely closet-writer. To quote from the "Reminiscences" of Mr. Charles T. Congdon:

"There must be perpetual alertness. There must be that accurate general knowledge which sends a man instantly to the right authority. There must be that self-suspicion, that distrust of memory, which sets one to searching; to say nothing of that industry which knows no difference between night and day. Whoever undertakes to write for a newspaper needs what Napoleon called the courage of four o'clock in the morning. He must have a hand to grasp a subject with celerity; to be able in twenty minutes to tear the heart out of it; to fasten upon all the points at a glance; to see their humor or their tragedy; to understand their relation to the general drift of his own newspaper; and to write about them in English which will keep the breakfaster for five minutes from his coffee and his rolls. Does anybody suppose that this is easy to do?"

Such achievement implies immense labor, and high art as well. It was labor, art, and love of the work which made the *Republican*. Its staff was much larger than was usual with papers similarly limited in circulation and revenues; its men were carefully chosen and trained; no office in the country worked its editors harder; and they gave to their task all that was in them.

The highest kind of news-reporting, and the function of the newspaper which surpasses even that, are de-

scribed in an article in the *Republican*, October 29, 1873, upon the great journal of England:

"One may well be impatient at the London *Times* for not being the guide rather than the body-guard of progress. It seeks to say upon any given day what the dominant minds of the country are saying. Not to force an illustration, we may call it the moderator of the assembly, who daily puts the question and records the vote, while the American press occupies rather the position of the debaters who have guided the assembly to its conclusions. Now, it is an open question whether in a nation like the British it is not of more importance to have one high authority, able by long experience and admitted ability to declare authoritatively to the nation its own maturest thought, than to have a great radical journal, keeping ahead of that maturest thought and exhorting it onward. The *Times* is the very ideal of pure journalism; it tells the news of the day, especially that highest class of news in comparison with which all other is mere gabble — *the nation's secret thought and dearest purpose.* When, during our own war, the *Times* sneered at our course, depend upon it, the ruling class of England sneered first. And when to-day the *Times* is kindly toward us, we may depend upon it as a piece of news that the ruling class of England are also kindly. As a newspaper, therefore, it has touched the zenith. But American journalism is not content to be mere journalism, a mere historian of the day. It intrudes into other spheres; it preaches, it teaches, it legislates, it reforms. It is not content with reporting what the public mind is thinking about; it insists that the public mind shall think about the right thing."

CHAPTER XLIX.

The Higher Journalism.

"IT is not content with reporting what the public mind is thinking about; it insists that the public mind shall think about the right thing." The *Republican*, in the full development of its later years, was and was meant to be in advance of the mass of its readers on the main lines of opinion. As a consequence it continually failed to get the sanction of the popular voice for the men and measures it advocated. To those whose test of power was immediate success, it seemed something like a failure, as a guide of public opinion. As one man said of its editor, "He was a shepherd whose sheep wouldn't follow him." A young member of the staff once reported to his chief a remark by a political manager in a neighboring town: "Your *Republican* is a smart newspaper, but it has no influence." "He is right," said Mr. Bowles; "we have very little influence, in his sense of the word. We don't often get our man nominated, or our ticket elected. But two or three years afterward the people get along up to the ground we have been standing on."

The *Republican* was an idealist in politics. It stood steadily according to its light for "whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report." Yet it spoke not as a prophet or a poet throws out his

word to find lodgment wherever the winds may carry it, but with the practical aim of ultimately securing the acceptance of its ideas by the community. "We must keep within speaking distance of our constituency," Mr. Bowles used to say to his young men, when their zeal threatened to outrun their discretion. The paper had for its target that mark which democracy sets before every reformer,—the mind and conscience of the average citizen. The preponderance of judgment and will in the entire people is an enormous weight for the idealist to raise. With the best leverage he can get,—and the newspaper is an incomparable lever,—he must be content to see the great mass stir very slowly, happy if he can say "It does move!"

With the *Republican*, politics was only one topic among many. A few of its editorial titles gathered from the file of 1873 are fairly characteristic of its later period: The Catholics in America, Holly-tree Christianity, The Halt of Christian Union, Compulsory Education, Mr. Frothingham's "Religion of Humanity," Is Agriculture Doomed in Massachusetts? The Sermon of Friday's Gallows, Some Claims of Women, Tax Reform and the Rural Mind, The Bible Revision, How to Grow Old, Theodore Parker, The Education of Boys, The Latest Arctic Travels, Servant Girls' Rights, The New Education, Coöperative Farming, The London Police Court, The Autumn Promise, Horses' Names, Prison Reform, A Chat about the Minor Poets, The Effect of Scientific Antagonism on Christian Teaching, City Work for the Unemployed, How to Help the Proud Poor, What War Means, The Death of Agassiz, The Life and Letters of Sara Coleridge, The State Reformatories, The Education of American Girls, Margaret Fuller's Life and Works, A New Phase of the English Labor Problem, The Agency of Prayer, Uncle Sam in the Naboth Business.—Well

might the paper have said of itself, "The field is the world!"

The character of a newspaper is the resultant of the characters of the men who control it. It unites powers and purposes which in their entirety are broader than any personality, but this is only the aggregate contribution of the men who built it up in the past and those who carry it on in the present. The only real moral force is personal, and a newspaper is simply the medium through which a man or a combination of men express themselves.

The man who created and inspired the *Republican* was one who had a strong regard for the moral relations. It was born in him; it grew with his growth; it was developed by his instinct to get always at the reality of things, which led him continually to a deeper and juster sense of the supreme realities of human conduct and character. There was in him also a strong sincerity, an intolerance of pretense and assumption, and a distaste for insignia and robes of state. He was impatient of all buckram dignitaries. He was too mercurial to stay in a mood of solemnity. Even when he wrote with most power and pathos, a jest was not far from the tip of his pen. He had a mischievous delight in startling people. The *Republican* sent many a cold shiver through the frames of pious folk. It won for itself with not a few the reputation of a rollicking and audacious heathen. But its lightness was the foam and bubble on the river's surface,— beneath it the current ran strong and steady toward the noble ends of life.

Mr. Bowles was earnest in maintaining that a newspaper should be impersonal. "The *Republican* and Sam Bowles are two different things," he was in the habit of saying. That difference may be illustrated by the treatment which the paper gave to subjects of a dis-

tinctively religious character. Here something less than Mr. Bowles, and something more, went into the paper. He was a Unitarian by education, and always by a more or less close connection; but the *Republican* was in no sense a Unitarian paper, nor did it show any special favor to that sect. Personally he followed some lines of speculation, as his letters show, to which he gave no expression in the *Republican;* these thoughts belonged to a part of his life which he did not share with the public. On the other hand, there were among his associates and subordinates various men whose equipment included special training and intelligence upon religious matters. Each one of these gave of his best to the paper. A central control preserved sufficient harmony, and the result was a more various and more impressive teaching than any single individual could give.

Dr. Holland's especial gift, as has been said, was that of a lay preacher. His favorite topics were those in which the moral aspect was predominant, and on such subjects he had a rare art of impressing and winning the common people. He was a member of the Orthodox communion, but his mind was not theologic or speculative; his habit was neither to assail dogma nor to employ it; his enforcement of right conduct had God and immortality as its accepted facts, and Jesus Christ as its supreme exemplar. His writings were widely welcomed, as men will always welcome a teacher who speaks as one having authority, who does not assail their prejudices, and who appeals to their best feelings and convictions.

Mr. Hood was felicitous in a different style of ethical writing. His mind had a fine vein of philosophy, and he was very familiar both with the literature of theology and the practical workings of the churches. He frequently wrote on such ecclesiastical topics as came to the surface in the every-day life of the community. In discussing

these themes he showed an admirable instinct for touching whatever was involved of essential morality and of public interest, while avoiding technicalities and subtleties. He was an adept in the conciliatory style of writing. He understood how to place himself on common ground with the well-disposed reader of whatever creed or sect, and from that ground to urge a view which embraced the essentials and ignored all besides. The *Republican* gave at one time, undoubtedly from his pen, a series of editorial articles on the leading Protestant sects, each of which it described with an intelligence, sympathy, and frank criticism, beyond what is often seen either in the secular or religious press. Among the successors of Mr. Hood in the office were more than one who had in an eminent degree the necessary culture and temper for discussing the topics both of ecclesiastical religion and of the spiritual life.

But it is with a newspaper as it is with a man,—its ethical character is most effectively when unconsciously expressed. Of the debt we owe our best friends for their influence upon us, how small a part consists of their intentional appeals to our sense of duty,—how much smaller yet, to their definitions of religious belief! It is the tone of their every-day conduct and conversation which lifts us. So, the *Republican's* characteristic moral quality might best be indicated by quoting its utterances, not on the especial themes of religion, but on general topics,— political discussions, obituary notices, literary criticisms, or general news of the day.

Mr. Bowles's summary of a man's character when death had completed his record, was often very felicitous. He seized the salient points, and made a presentation which without gloss or flattery set forth the essential man in his worthiest and most impressive aspect. But in the case of a public character, he recognized the right

of his readers to have the fair and full lesson, from errors as well as virtues. Mr. Curtis, in his eulogy of Wendell Phillips, said, by way of justification of a portrait without shadows: "I speak not of the mortal part of him, but of that which was immortal." Mr. Bowles did not practice this kind of portraiture. He wrote to Charles Allen, in July, 1859: "I hate the *Nil de mortuis*, etc. What do men die for except that posterity may impartially judge, and get the full benefit of their example?" The occasion of the remark was the unqualified laudation of Rufus Choate. "I am aching to pitch into Choate," he wrote, "and shall do it yet, ungracious as Boston may think it. I don't believe he was a bright and shining light of the profession, in at least one very important particular." And in the *Republican*, a few days later,—the great advocate having in previous numbers received generous praise,—there is an editorial on "Mr. Choate's Glory and Shame as a Lawyer." The glory of his genius, learning, and eloquence is heartily recognized; as to the shame:

"We refer to what was notorious in the profession, to what in one form had passed into a by-word with the public,—his disregard of truth and justice in the undertaking and trial of causes. In assuming a suit or a defense, he never seemed to ask, 'Is this right? does my client seek the ends of truth and justice?' Nor in the prosecution of a case did he ever seem to hesitate in the use of doubtful and dishonest means to secure the end. Espousing the interest and object of his client with great ardor, he used all the powers of his mind, all the graces of his oratory, all the suggestions which a reckless ingenuity or a desperate strait prompted, to reach the desired result. Too often doubtless he was successful by these means, and if many a time justice has been vindicated, and the truth unraveled, and endangered right has triumphed, through his splendid efforts, when they would otherwise have failed, too often by the same intervention has the wrong gloried in success, justice been per-

verted, and the criminal screened from the punishment due to his offenses. No cause seemed so desperate or so bad that he would not undertake its defense; no suggestion of law, no trick of forms, so shallow or puerile that he would not press it into service for his purpose."

A characteristic piece of Mr. Bowles's work was his obituary of General William Francis Bartlett, December 18, 1876. It was written, as a private letter shows, on the same night that the news of his death was received; and its substance is largely a recital of facts which have since been given more fully in the admirable biography by Mr. Palfrey:

"The Massachusetts of this generation has bred no so heroic a character as that of the man whom she will bury, with sadness and with honor, in Berkshire this week." He left Harvard College to enlist at the breaking out of the war, and served till the end. He was wounded many times, lost a leg, endured extreme hardships in Southern prisons, and was a sufferer from his injuries during all his remaining years. His later life was spent in private business. "With no ambition and no pretense as an orator or public leader, hardly any man in these last three years has oftener or better said the timely word, and turned men's thoughts from party passion and personal advantage in politics to higher things both in thought and effort. His eloquence was the eloquence of simplicity, earnestness, and brevity." His speeches, at the dedication of Harvard Memorial Hall, at the Lexington Centennial, and on other occasions, "all bore one spirit, they all sought one end,—that of the burial of the conflicts of the war in a common national feeling." At Lexington he said: "Men cannot always choose the right course; but when, having chosen that which conscience dictates, they are ready to die for it, if they justify not their cause, they at least ennoble themselves; and the men who for conscience' sake fought against their government at Gettysburg ought easily to be forgiven by the sons of men who for conscience' sake fought against their government at Bunker Hill." He held himself

aloof from party bonds, and parties competed for the honor of his name. "This is the outline of a life so far as it appeared to the public. But it was as noble and heroic in private, and the sweetness that goes with all true nobility and heroism was as divine a characteristic of General Bartlett's nature. He faced the slow, sure approach of death as bravely and as calmly as he moved to the front in battle, or denounced a mean thought or unworthy action in public or private life. We talk with a glow of Chevalier Bayard and Sir Philip Sidney; but here, in Frank Bartlett, was all they were, and more,—what they could not be, because the standards of the age did not suggest it all. A republic based on the equality of men, and a society that recognizes woman not simply as an object of gallantry, but the companion-leader of all life, give a finer quality and a more even edge to our Bayards and our Sidneys. . . . General Bartlett's fortune was his character, his family, and his friends. The one is clear and unspotted; the next, a beautiful wife and five young children—the youngest of whom, a babe of few weeks, was baptized, as it were, in his dying arms, but a few days ago, while he partook of the last sacrament, and himself sang the sacramental hymn with a voice as clear and ringing as that with which he ever called his soldiers to battle; and his friends include everybody who ever knew him."

Very characteristic of Mr. Bowles were some of his comments on California, which he called "a double-flowering species of the American genus." The high expectations of the state from the Pacific Railroad, which he had fully shared, were not fully met when the road was completed. At that time, February 14, 1870, he summed up the history and needs of the state:

"For twenty years she has been living, as it were, apart, isolated, and building up a magnificent provincialism. Her nature was original, her resources original, and her modes of doing business took on original laws, as all her life took on original habits. . . . High prices, vast profits, a grand and reck-

less way of business and of life, pervaded all her society and all her movements. She had but two pieces of money — double-eagles and half-dollars. The one did the morning marketing, the other was tossed to the gentleman who watered your horse or swung the gates for your passage. Money came easy and it went easy. The community drank champagne before breakfast, and lived all day a sort of champagne life, white with foam and bubbling with gas." This order of things,— to condense Mr. Bowles's words,— was first shaken by the break-down of placer mining; was then prolonged awhile by the wonderful results of wheat culture; but now the Pacific Railroad, with communication with the outside world, has come as a great leveler, and the first season following has been a time of depression and discouragement. "At first the people seemed stunned with the revelation and the revolution. They cursed the railroad, they cursed the Bank of California, and they cursed the Chinese, one and all, as the parents of the disappointment." But now they have braced themselves to face the change with courage and cheer. "Summed up in a single word, perhaps the material need of California is *five-cent pieces*,— their presence and their use. Beyond this, she lacks a broader and finer sense of the various elements of civilization; — she needs more widely to see and to feel that the greatest good for the greatest number is both the welfare and the wealth of society. The disposition to 'corral' everything, from quicksilver to wheat, from the Comstock lode to the agricultural lands, from newspapers to railroads and universities, not omitting indeed social life itself, is a great obstacle to California's healthy development.

"The pride of power, the pride of wealth, the pride of materiality, has indeed a strong grip upon California society and California business. It is natural that it should be so. Through it great results have been achieved, great advancement made; but in the revolution now going on the law of disintegration and variety will be demanded in business and must be respected in society. Culture and brain and character, the ameliorations of the refined soul and the inspirations of the elevated spirit, must count as at least the equal of bank

shares and mining feet; and in business, diversification, and rivalry should be encouraged rather than stamped out by the iron heel of grasping monopoly. The more and the more various channels life flows through, the more fertile is the soil of society, the more bountiful the harvest of effort."

Five years after this was written, the great Bank of California went down in sudden ruin, and its president, Ralston, was drowned, — apparently, though not certainly, a suicide. The morning after the news was received, August 28, 1875, Mr. Bowles made this comment:

"Mr. Ralston was, before he was forty-five years old, the director of more and more various power than any man on the Pacific coast, and we believe, except the President of the United States, than any man in the country. Without personal vanity, he had vast personal pride and ambition; he sought power, not notoriety. Without the culture of books, he had a perception of men and affairs alike deep and quick and broad. Ready to use questionable means for desired results, overleaping obstacles to his pleasure or his power with small scruple as to minor morals, he yet acted upon broader and higher principles of business integrity than many of his contemporaries and most of his rivals. He embodied, in short, the best and worst characteristics of California civilization, which owes more to him than it probably ever will acknowledge, which will profit equally by his daring wisdom, his generous mistakes, and we trust, though doubtingly, also by his unpardonable errors. There was much indeed to remind one of Napoleon in Mr. Ralston's character and history and manner. The parallel could be carried into many details of high excellence, marvelous power, strange inconsistency, and positive vice. . . . The failure of the bank is directly traceable to two causes. First, the wide extension of its credit and that of Mr. Ralston in business enterprises. . . . The second cause is the bank's loss of the control of the bullion market through the bonanza discoveries, and its futile attempt in the late mining stock speculations to regain it by getting possession of the bonanza

mines. . . . His tragic end is perhaps a fit, certainly it is a natural, complement to his brilliant progress. The one warns if the other dazzles. It is California to the last. His pride was in his bank — there was no life for him out of it. That ruined, and by himself as none knew better than he, there was nothing left for his proud, passionate, sympathetic nature, but to make a grave for his body, and so while we are shocked we are not surprised that the telegraph announces while we are writing that Mr. Ralston drowned himself last evening. . . . The bank may be said indeed to have died of the disease which it created, in a passionate struggle to outlive its own opportunity and time. California has passed beyond such a supremacy as the Bank of California achieved, such an autocrat as Mr. Ralston had become. Neither could take a lower place, and so they died."

The paper's discussions of questions of social morality were always conservative of the institutions and sentiments that guard personal purity. An article on divorce, April 20, 1870, is shown by a private letter to have been by Mr. Bowles. The occasion was a bill before the legislature, relaxing somewhat the strictness of the existing provisions. The law at that time allowed divorces only for adultery, or desertion for five years, and forbade the offending party to marry again without special permission from the court. The new bill shortened the requisite period of desertion to three years, and allowed marriage to both parties. The bill was passed by the House, but failed in the Senate. In opposing it the *Republican* said:

"Single life should be the penalty paid for the mistake of a wrong mating. Marriage and divorce alike need this conservative influence. Marriages will be more thoughtfully and carefully made, divorces less eagerly sought, under such a rule. We would that separations, with provisions for the division of property, or the partial or complete support of the weaker by the stronger party, 'without distinction of sex,'— might be

more readily obtained from our courts; we would that divorces, with liberty to remarry, were even more difficult than now. Such separations would leave the door open to reconciliation and return; would, indeed, often so result; and the law should not only provide for but invite this sequel. But the rule of marriage should be that one failure suffices. It would bear terribly hard, we know, in many cases; but the gain to society would be greater than the suffering to individuals; the advantage would be on the side of morality and the strengthening of the marriage tie and the family relation. The future may discover some modification of such a rule that will do less harm than good; but for now, and for the evils that so greatly beset us, we believe there is no other so important to be maintained as this."

No cause was dearer to Mr. Bowles's heart than that of larger opportunities for women. His most elaborate argument for it was an editorial of two columns and a half in the *Republican* of February 14, 1870, entitled: "The New Reform — Woman's Rights and Man's Rights—The Question Restated." He sets aside as inadequate the presentation most frequently made by the professional reformers, and from a different stand-point puts the case so broadly and so reasonably that no full justice can be done by partial quotations. His leading thought is that the question is not so much of rights to be conceded to women, as of duties to be assumed by them.

"We have heard constantly of women's wrongs and women's rights, of woman the slave, of man the tyrant; but rarely or never of woman's responsibilities, of woman's exemptions and privileges, of man's rights and wrongs, of man's special and extra burdens for women, of the equalization and fair division of the work of life. . . . We hear always of woman's wrongs and abuses, never of her immunities and privileges; and yet the latter are equally the badge of inferiority with the former.

It is of as much importance that she should discard the one as that she should be relieved of the other." He objects to the common assumption that men alone are responsible for the inferior position of women; and sets aside as unjust all recrimination between the sexes, for that inequality which was an inevitable incident of the early stages of civilization. "We have been growing steadily up to the present phase of the question, through all the centuries of the Christian era. The woman's movement began with the birth in the manger; it has progressed constantly, if slowly, from then till now; and the present is only a new form, an extension of an old question; not an original issue. If Susan Anthony had lived three hundred years ago, it would doubtless have come on sooner; but God in his inscrutable wisdom has kept her back till now—and so the movement is behindhand, perhaps.

"The great truth that we should all see and accept on this question is this: That in the revolutionary order of life, in the progress of society and of government out of the issues of force and toward the laws of a common brotherhood, in the multiplication of duties which this enlargement of our responsibilities brings upon society, in the steady education and elevation of woman to a social and intellectual equality with man, we have reached that point where it is both desirable and necessary that woman should assume her place as an integral unit in life, and take a larger and more independent share in all its duties and responsibilities. This proposition seems to us to flow naturally out of our civilization, out of the wonderful accumulation of work pressing upon every thoughtful and conscientious member of society, out of the enlarged capacity of woman, out of her yearnings for a fuller life, out of the overburdened condition of her husband, brothers, sons, and father.

"Putting aside the labor absolutely necessary by both men and women for their daily subsistence, few will deny how much more heavily the serious burdens of outward life fall upon the men — the maintenance of government in all its ramifications, the earning of money for comforts and for luxuries, providing for education, for the development of art in all its branches, for the care of the sick and the poor and the wicked, for claim-

ing and reclaiming the orphans of society of every grade and name, and generally, indeed, the feeding and filling the whole wide and rapidly widening spheres into which our life is opening. And yet how large a share of all these questions, of all these duties, women are or may easily become quite as competent as men to deal with! So of the more special work of modern individual life, the industries which go to make up our civilization, so different from those of former generations — how full these all are of labor equally fitted, much of it more fitted, for the hand of woman than of man. It is out of all this enlargement and diversification and multiplication of both the duties of society and the work of the individual that the call and the necessity for the new career for women has come. This is simply what the new reform seeks — the opening of all these duties, all this work of life, to woman equally with man. It is not simply woman's right to do it, it is her duty. It is man's right, too, to have her share in this aggregation of responsibility which civilization with its master strides has forced upon him. Suffrage is but a token; legal equality is but an opportunity; these are the real, actual elements of the woman's movement. It means nothing if it does not mean that she shall take up and perform her share of all this work. Some of it, of course, she cannot do as well as man, other she certainly can do better; but it has become too big, too vast, too delicate, for man alone to perform; and it is not right, it is shame rather than sense, that, while he is thus overburdened, woman should sit idly in carpeted and pictured parlors, half listless from inanition, accepting life's bounties, but shirking life's duties.

"Given, first, legal reform, making men and women, husbands and wives, equally responsible to each other, to their children, to their creditors, and to society, in all matters of authority, of property, of control, of obligation; and, secondly, equality of women with men in suffrage,— and we have the real, outward, visible tokens of the pending revolution. The legal reform we regard as even more important and more practically pressing of the two. The need of that is clear; we are educated up to it; the effects will be at once beneficent; while suffrage is not suffering for women nor women greatly for it;

and the early results of its gift to them now before they are prepared for it and generally seeking it, are of doubtful flavor. But in a republic the ballot-box stands for position, stands for responsibility, stands for power; and so, rather as a sign than as the thing itself, is it desirable, and is it naturally put in the front of the new movement. Every real onward movement in history is marked by growing consideration of woman. Civilization is but the advance of the feminine element in life and in government. Macaulay said there never was a great man without a good deal of woman in him. So it is and will be more and more with our civilization. The larger the proportion of the feminine element, the higher becomes its advance, the purer its life, the broader its aims. This cause is not only the cause of woman, but the cause of man and the cause of God."

The following passage,— August 30, 1875,— written by a member of the staff on the occasion of a meeting in New York in honor of Goethe, drew from the chief a word of cordial praise:

"It was in one sense admirable to have that wonderful old man, Mr. Bryant, speaking of one so long dead, yet in whose prime of life the dawn of his sun arose, so that the two men might easily have known each other in the flesh. Yet a character more unlike to and more unsympathetic with Goethe could hardly be found. The German, though intellectually so far greater, though sweeping a vaster horizon and wielding a power to which the American is as nothing,— for he created an epoch in thought and its expression,— was infinitely the inferior of our poet in moral stature. We are aware that it is an affectation in our day to treat the trifling of a genius with social and domestic relations as an error quite condoned by the circumstances of his genius. Within a day or two we have read an exaltation of Goethe as living an earnest, impulsive, courageous, noble life. The cantata sung at this celebration contained glowing acknowledgment of his services to woman, his leading 'the thirsty soul to drink of love's pure cleansing bowl,' etc.

These are wholesale idealizations. But in truth Goethe was a man of colossal selfishness, and without scruple all his life long devoured the fresh sweetness of woman's awakening heart as the due of his development, the food of his culture. This is what any reader of Goethe's life will say, who is not blinded by the glamour of his godlike mind. 'Godlike' is a word that belongs to him of all men; since the earth woke out of chaos have the serpent's words been truest of Goethe; he indeed 'became as a god, knowing good and evil.'"

Nothing was more characteristic of the *Republican* than its attitude toward the churches and the questions connected with them. The half-century of Mr. Bowles's life witnessed immense changes in the social life of the Connecticut Valley. The multiplying of interests, the new forms of industry, the quickening of pace, the widened range of thought, the change in the whole aspect of the community, were such as volumes could not describe. The church organizations necessarily partook of the general change; but, as is generally the case with religious institutions, they showed a tenacity and conservatism beyond most other departments of social life. They continued to include in their membership a preponderance of the social respectability, the intelligence, and the virtue of the community. In their formal creeds there was little change; but their preaching showed a growing indisposition to emphasize the harsher elements of the creed, and a growing insistence on ethical rather than dogmatic themes. The thought and research which within that period had unsettled the foundations of the ancient creed of Christendom, were of course felt throughout the intellectual part of the community — or rather through the whole community; no social stratum has any longer a belief or a doubt peculiar to itself. But whatever of radical doubt or dissent existed lay largely beneath the surface. The ministry were as a body very conservative of the sub-

stance and most of the form of the ancient faith. The churches created an atmosphere throughout the community which made open dissent unpleasant for most men who wished to live on good terms with their neighbors. They assumed to offer the only way to a right life in this world, and to something better beyond this world. Those who did not in their hearts admit the assumption seldom cared to openly deny, still less to defy it.

The *Republican* acquiesced neither openly nor tacitly in the churches' assumption of an infallible way of salvation. But neither did it make war upon the churches, or ignore them. It always assumed that they were a great and useful instrumentality in improving the community. It recognized them as associations for helping men in right living. It discussed their practical methods as freely as it discussed questions of politics. Just as it reported as a matter of news the progress of opinion among scientists concerning Darwinism, or among philosophers concerning evolution, so it took note of theological movements and controversies. Whenever questions of church administration had a direct bearing on the practical interests of the community, the paper not only reported them as news, but took part in the debate as an advocate. A contributor once offered an editorial in regard to the ostracism of the liberal sects by the orthodox; the form of expression being, "To the world, looking on at the conduct of the church which seeks to convert it, it would appear," etc. Mr. Bowles sent back the article with the answer: "There is a fault of construction in your article for the *Republican*. We have always discussed these questions as insiders, and not as outsiders. I have no idea of giving up the churches to the ministers and deacons." As to all questions of dogma, the *Republican's* habitual ground was not that some particular doctrine was true or false, but that all doctrines should

be held and used with reference to the moral advancement of men; that no question of intellectual belief should stand in the way of anything which could make men stronger, sweeter, more useful to the community. It took no such definite and precise attitude as to mooted questions of theology as it did in regard to political topics. Its manifest sympathy always lay with the affirmations of spiritual faith, as opposed to materialism and agnosticism. Toward the various theories of the spiritual life, its tone was catholic, sympathetic, impartial. From occasional utterances, and by reading between the lines, some special tendency of religious thought might be attributed to the paper as its characteristic. This tendency varied with its successive periods. Dr. Holland sometimes identified the paper quite positively with a moderate orthodoxy. Later, under Mr. Hood's influence, it might have been approximately classed as liberal orthodox or broad church. Subsequently, its distinctive sympathy was with the class who emphasize a spiritual faith, but omit what is generally called supernaturalism — the class of whom Emerson is the chief representative. But it never made itself the aggressive champion of any of these schools. It gave fair report of old school and new, of rationalist and supernaturalist, of Renan and Newman, of Parker and Moody,— it welcomed whatever in the work of each was helpful, whatever in the thought of each was inspiring.

Its independence of creeds was distasteful to the professional guardians of orthodoxy. Its free criticism of churches and ministers often drew on it the wrath, not only of the immediate object of criticism, but of the ecclesiastical body in general, sensitive at seeing its dignitaries so summarily dealt with. There were times when this ecclesiastical hostility became general and even formidable. There seems to have been one such

period especially, of which, however, no record has been found, except the memory of a remark made by Mr. Bowles to one of his lieutenants when the Greeley fight was hot. "This isn't anything like as bad as the battle we had with the church folks. Every parsonage in the valley was a base of operations against us. We won our religious independence then, and I guess we shall win our political independence now." It always had some of the clergy among its warmest friends, and not a few of them were in its list of contributors.

The *Republican's* editor was in full sympathy with the saying of William H. Channing: "The true church of God is organized human society." His conceptions of the church and of the newspaper were never better given than in a letter to Dr. Frederick D. Huntington. It was written April 4, 1861, amid the crowding interests of impending war; dashed off at racing speed by his own hand, and so illegible that a copy was taken and sent, the original being preserved. Dr. Huntington had, not long before this, passed from the Unitarian into the Episcopal body, and was now one of the editors of the *Church Monthly*, which had some crossing of swords with the *Republican*. Thereupon Dr. Huntington wrote to Mr. Bowles, with whom he was on friendly personal terms:

BOSTON, April 2, 1861.

DEAR FRIEND: You have lost your patience, it seems. Well, I am disappointed. I counted on something better, in a discussion with you, than the school-girl style, "My house is just as smart as yours," — something better than a mere bandying of old phrases — some handling of ideas, and a deeper look into the real issue. . . . Is it according to the honorable etiquette of journalism to single out one of two editors of a print whose articles all appear impersonally, and connect his name conspicuously with a particular paper, and he an old friend? . . . "Church of the people!" I thought it was

the "Church of God"—and *for* men. No, my friend, do not discredit your political and financial character by saying you discuss these matters no more "thoroughly" than you discuss theology.

From this letter, and from Mr. Bowles's reply, there are omitted here some passages bearing only on transient and personal topics. The correspondence ended with expression of friendship on both sides. Mr. Bowles's answer, so far as it touched matters of impersonal and lasting interest, was as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, April 4, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR: I am glad you wrote; I had somewhat to say, and now have more. Had I written the *Republican's* article, you might have kept the pain, but the place would have been changed. I had neither time, health, nor heart for it, and passed it to Holland, with the general line of argument. It is rather rough, more personal and dogmatic than mine would have been; but I do not shirk any responsibility for it. The objections to it are with me matters of taste. The principle and points were right—only I would have put them more subtly—perhaps as subtly as you yours; but you might not have liked me better, for I was stirred with some feeling at parts of your article.

. . . As to personality, you are theoretically and substantially right. I believe in the impersonality of the press, thoroughly, and try to act on it. But you blazon *your* names on the title-page; *we* announce no editors, and have none, that the world has a right to individualize. You invite personality; we ignore and reject it; yet your article *individualized*, both in praise and blame, the original quoted criticism. Subtly and delicately, it is true, but none the less, aye, all the more keenly, to one person at least, perhaps to a few. When you told your readers that the *Republican* writer had no business to write about the Church because he had not studied its history from the beginning, and when you told him and your readers, in effect, that he had better be "converted" before he ventured

to discuss with you religious subjects,—was there not a savor of offensive personality? to say nothing of an unbecoming priestly assumption? Perhaps you were not quite conscious how you put these things; but you ought to have been, and if I had written the reply I should have tried to make you, after the fact at least. The simple philosophy of the Gospel has been "revealed to babes" as to the "wise and prudent." It does not require the learning of the schools to comprehend it, or to apply it to life, to individuals, or to denominations, and measure them. That is all we essay to do—all we did do. You liked it, and our way of doing it, when we applied it in rebuke to those who assailed your freedom of action, and following of Christ in a new and better way; but you don't like it when we apply the same principle to your ultra-denominationalism. I was arraigned in Boston t'other day, for my article on "Fighting Christians," defending you from Unitarian bigotry and malevolence, and now you and your friends arraign us for disputing Episcopalian bigotry and presumption. But that is inevitable from our position, of course. Personally, these presumptions to the only way to salvation cause no distress or feeling save of pity for the ignorance that sustains it in some cases, and sorrow for the party zeal that induces its expression in those who really know better. But the *Republican* has assumed a ground here to which you hardly do justice, and it fights against all disputants. It is greater than the practice or position of its editors—higher than denominations or sects, as life is greater than thought, practice than profession, Christianity than theology, piety than prayer. It seems to me to stand above the strife of sects, above the "bandying of phrases," and to reach to the truest and purest ideas of the Divine purpose. I thought the school-girl style was "My house is *better* than yours," and that is the style of your article and of all denominational strife. We are content to say they are all alike—to put them in one great plan, or scheme, each having excellencies, each defects, each having its field, its work, its mission, and all seeking the glory of God and the purification and the elevation of men. Individually, each of us may have our choice and preference; but is not the idea of

the journal worthy of respect — is it not great and noble enough to be put along with your ideas? Are we not greater — you confess it — than the denominational papers? And does your position justify you in looking down upon us, and forbidding us because we follow not with you?

All churches are of God; but men administer their human machinery; and whether a few men shall administer them *for* the rest, or all *for* all, is the question between Congregationalism and Episcopacy, and on this there is much to be said for or against. Your article neither said nor suggested Church of God for the people, but was strong with the flavor of a Church of men for the people, and our suggestion *of* the people was pat to that. It would be presumption in *me* to pretend to discuss theology as thoroughly as politics, but *I* have made no such pretense. The *Republican* has, and has the right to, because it can command, and does command, talent and learning equally in both sciences. It has on its regular editorial staff one man as learned in all the dry and disgusting lore of the theological schools as ninety-nine out of a hundred clergymen, and another whose fervor and unction as a lay preacher is hardly less than that of the rector of Emmanuel himself in the pulpit. Pray make the distinction.

. . . I trust and believe you will never find the *Republican* or its editors giving you other than the word of commendation, and clearing the path for you in any good and live work to which you lay your earnest hand. Its sympathies and its hopes are in the right direction. In the quick judgments and rough, direct diction of daily journalism, it must assuredly often mistake, often wound; and wanton doubtless is it in its freedom of utterance; but I know that its heart is right, and that you and such as you ought never long or seriously to have reason to complain of it.

. . . I have been writing against time and strength, for it is at the end of a long and busy day, and to-morrow I go to Washington for a fortnight; and so this letter is too long, and is so sadly in the editorial chirography that it must be copied if you would read it,— so you have it in a fair hand, and I am yours very truly,

SAM'L BOWLES.

New York, 6th. Leaving this to be copied, it reaches me here, and rather astonishes me by its length and presumption. Yet, if you will take it in the spirit that prompted it, and with the cordial respect for your talents and position, and large hope for your usefulness, that, stimulated by your criticisms and suggestions, have accompanied its every utterance, the writing and the reading will at least have done no harm. . . . I shall send you the *Republican*, for I wish you to see that its pretensions to being a religious as well as a political paper —"to discuss religious questions" (not theology purely or mainly) "and distribute religious intelligence"— these being our words — are not mere pretensions. Our idea of a public journal covers all life— life in its deepest and highest significance— as well as the superficialities of food and raiment, business and government.

One more quotation may here be given from the *Republican's* later utterances on religious subjects,—in an editorial of December 3, 1874, on "John Stuart Mill as a Theologian"; the occasion being the publication of his posthumous essays. The article does not bear the mark of Mr. Bowles's hand, but is in full harmony with the larger personality of the *Republican* itself.

"The misconception which runs through the two essays of Mill on 'The Utility of Religion' and on 'Theism' is indeed that which lies at the bottom of the whole utilitarian philosophy; namely, that the human soul acts only or chiefly upon selfish motives, and that human life in this world and the next is an affair of logic and comprehensible by the understanding. However high the point of cultivation reached, however noble the morality which rests upon reasoning, there is always a beyond where the divine powers, the supernatural attitudes of the soul, range free and direct our activity. In that realm the hope of pleasure and the fear of pain are equally indifferent to the enlightened spirit, and all the ordinary sanctions and promoting causes of religion shrink out of sight. The oriental legend of the believer who was met on the road with a torch in one hand

and a pitcher of water in the other, conveys a meaning which seems almost beyond the apprehension of Mr. Mill. 'With this fire,' said the mystic, 'I go to burn up the palaces of Heaven, and with this water to quench the flames of Hell, so that man hereafter may worship God truly, and no longer serve him for hope or for fear.'

"The sadness of the book is neither depressing nor likely to infect others; its warnings and encouragements are all of a high mood, and its errors are such as throw no blame upon its author. . . . To this great man, lingering upon the confines of the two worlds, and sharpening his vision with love and regret toward the world unseen and almost despaired of, the life of mankind assumed a serious and tender aspect, not devoid of a melancholy hope, and rich in virtuous manly endeavors and accomplished deeds. The truly devout alone have the right to censure him, for he stands, like Stoics and the highest of the followers of Epicurus, far above the plane of the ordinary religions of the world. Such souls need the teachings of Christ himself, not the discourses of Paul or of the ecclesiastics."

The church and the clergy have high functions which the press cannot share. The personal "cure of souls"; the spoken word of inspiration sent home with the impact which only face and figure and voice can impart; the organization for direct mutual help in the conduct of life; the supplying of a visible basis and stronghold for the moral forces of the community,—these are still the church's province. But men no longer look to the church's pulpit, as they used to look, for guidance in thought and opinion. That scepter has passed to the journalist. He, in a broader sense than any other, is the teacher of the community,—at least the official teacher, for the highest leadership is not an office, but a personal endowment. The transfer of authority has been going on for centuries, but it was consummated in that same third of a century in which Mr. Bowles built up the *Republican*. In the beginning of that period it might

have been fair to take Dr. Peabody, pastor of the Unitarian church in Springfield, as the type of the public teacher in New England,— a dignified personage, speaking his weekly word from the pulpit, clad in gown of solemn black; dwelling much on the transitoriness and woe of this present life; urging an ideal of character which was pure and lofty, but had few points of contact with the matter-of-fact world in which his hearers must needs live. Against this figure thirty years later we may set the journalist at his desk, alert, high-strung; the telegraph pouring upon him the news of the whole planet, with now and then an item from the solar system beyond; his swift pen touching every interest of politics, trade, society, conduct, faith, every phase of the great world's teeming activities. He is now the king,— well for him if he be also the saint and prophet! "You see in me only a fraction of the king," Mr. Bowles would have said,—"here is the real sovereign, the paper itself,— with world-wide agencies at its command; fed by the life-juices of many workers; governed by an ideal which is a birth of the age-spirit, and which unstinted labor and love have built up. The life I have planted in the paper is as distinct from my own as the life which a father transmits to his son, and it shall live when I and my sons have passed away."

CHAPTER L.

Personal Glimpses.

SUCH was his work; so he made his contribution to the great world,—how did he show himself in these last years to those who met him in the every-day paths?

One of the *Republican's* staff who was detailed for a while as his secretary tells the impression he received:

"I went upon the paper as a green hand, and after two weeks he made me his secretary. I went at first in much fear; they had told me in the office I should have a bad time. For months I did not get over being frightened, for though he had been kind the day before, I feared to-day he might be severe. I made many mistakes, some very bad ones, but he never gave me a cross word. He could be more severe and cutting in two or three words than any man I ever knew; but to me he was always kind. Men who came in to see him at the office sometimes said he was a bear. But I never knew him sharp to an outsider except when he was driven to the wall. When he was busy, some man would come in with a long story,—he would listen patiently and give his answer. The man would perhaps ask him to change: a pleasant 'Can't do it, sir,' would be the reply. If the visitor persisted, he would say, '*No*,' sharply. If then the man was foolish enough to keep on, let him look out for himself.

"I used to spend two or three hours with him at his home in the morning, as much in the office in the afternoon, and be at his house again from eight and a half or nine till eleven. Some-

times he dictated very fast; sometimes slowly and ponderingly. I never could see that he was much influenced in what he wrote by his health or his mood. Sometimes, when I could see he was feeling blue, he would dictate bright and humorous things. He enjoyed his sharp sayings. I made a point of never letting my face show what I thought about what I was writing; but once I failed. A religious weekly had been nagging the *Republican* very meanly; he took no notice till the time was ripe, and then he gave them an article. It wound up with a story so funny, I couldn't keep my face straight. I glanced round, hoping he didn't see me,—he was in a favorite attitude, leg over a chair, elbow on knee, hand over face, and was watching me through his fingers to see how I took it. Then I exploded, and so did he,—he laughed till the tears ran down his face. In working hours, he very rarely spoke to me of anything but the work. I saw him a number of times in his family, where he was a totally different man. He asked me there repeatedly, at Thanksgiving and Christmas,—I suppose because I was a stranger and a poor little wretch. At such times he was as jolly as a man could be, a perfect boy. Next morning at work again, solemn as a judge!

"I always felt obliged to do my best with him; his eye saw everything. I almost worshiped him. There was more religion in my feeling toward him than in almost anything else in me."

With his friends who were in public life, his relations were variously affected by the *Republican's* independent and critical attitude. With Mr. Dawes, it brought him into frequent antagonism. Of their long friendship, Mr. Dawes says: "It was a succession of gushing confidences and flashing indignations,—of complaints and reconciliations,—a twenty-five-years' conflict of irreconcilabilities,—and through it all I was more attached to him than to any one outside of my family." Of one occasion Mr. Dawes tells this story:

"One morning the *Republican* came to me at my house in Pittsfield, containing a bitter attack on me, saying in substance

that I was a rogue. By the same mail came an invitation from Sam to a dinner at his house that evening, given in honor of Marshall Jewell, who was going to Europe. By way of answer, I wrote as ugly a telegram as I knew how,— and my wife tore it up. Then I wrote a letter, and she tore that up. Then I took the train for Springfield, telegraphing him to meet me at the depot. He was there, and I said to him: 'You have done two things that no decent man would do in the same day — you have called me a thief in the morning and asked me to dinner in the evening.' 'There is no such thing in the paper.' 'There it is, read it!' 'I didn't know it was there,— and you must remember that the Springfield *Republican* is one thing, and Sam Bowles is another.' 'You're the only man in the United States who says that or thinks it. To-morrow, if I accept your invitation, every one who has read that article will read my name among the diners at your house, and will say, "What a spoon Dawes is!" Now I won't go to your house till that thing is settled.' We talked for fifteen minutes — blazed away at each other, and made up. The next my family heard from me was a telegram asking that my dress-coat be sent down! After the dinner we walked to the depot together; he took a seat in the car beside me, and for fifteen minutes before the train started we had one of the most delightful and charming talks we ever had."

He could not always hold inexorably to his standard of impartiality between the public and his friends. He was once privately taken to task for being too lenient in one case toward a public man who was his friend. His answer was, "I've already got my hand against every man and every man's hand against me — and I can't keep it up forever! I *can't* drive this man too to the wall!"

There was often a difference between his public and private treatment of the same individual which was bewildering to a looker-on, and sometimes to the man himself. "I was with him in Maine on a fishing excursion," says an acquaintance, "and Mr. Blaine came into the car. It

was just before the 1876 convention, and the *Republican* had been berating Blaine. But when he appeared Sam greeted him as if he had been his long-lost brother! They sat down together and had a long familiar talk. Blaine once said of him to me, 'He's the most *undependable* cuss!' Some people thought him perfidious,—that he would draw a man out in conversation and afterward go against him." The truth was simply that Mr. Bowles gave a perfectly honest expression to the different feelings awakened in him by the different traits in the same man. If he thought Mr. Blaine untrustworthy as a politician, the *Republican* said as much;—if at the same time he recognized agreeable personal qualities in Mr. Blaine, he was glad to meet him. It was like the case of soldiers who during an hour's truce meet in hearty good-fellowship, without prejudice to their right to shoot each other when the signals call them to business again. No two men in Massachusetts fought each other longer and more heartily than Sam Bowles and Ben Butler. But when they happened to meet there was a hand-shake, perhaps an exchange of good stories, and a hearty laugh. They used to meet so on the floor of the House at Washington; and at the Worcester convention, when Butler made his last fight for the Republican nomination for governor, the two foemen had a few moments of friendly chat.

An occasional visitor at Springfield thus describes the man as he saw him:

"As I met Mr. Bowles occasionally during the last five or six years of his life, I felt in him a quality like that of a fine October day. I used to run into his office for a brief call, during my flying visits to Springfield, and I always found him ready to turn from his work for a half-hour's talk. When we differed strongly in opinion, as happened once or twice, I was always conscious of a perfect sincerity in him, and a freedom

from bitterness, which made personal hostility impossible. I hardly ever knew a man who could so stanchly maintain his views against yours, yet give so little offense, even when the subject involved deep feeling. Once, after a vigorous tilt, I wrote him a few lines, saying that our disagreement could not disturb the good-will between us, and in reply I received a charming note. It began like this: 'I don't think you could have used an hour of Thanksgiving day to better purpose than in writing me this assurance of your friendship. I feared I had sinned away my day of grace with you and yours.'

"I knew he was one of the hardest-worked men in Springfield, and yet he was *the* person whose company I used to seek as a cordial and restorative. To be with him was as good as a sun-bath. I sometimes called on Sunday, his leisure day, to ask him out for a stroll, and he was always ready to go. The talk would run lightly and racily over many topics. I remember once his playfully chiding me because, instead of keeping on the sidewalk, I was treading down the border of grass — even in the smallest things he had a sense of what was due to the rights of other men or the public. He listened as well as he spoke. His talk was full of little unexpected turns,—in the midst of sober discussion, a flash of enlivenment; on the heels of an argument, a sudden admission. I once took him to task for printing some matter I thought unfit for publication,—he defended it as necessary evidence in a great case; and, after unflinchingly maintaining that it was all right, said, 'I haven't read it!' 'Then how can you justify it?' 'Because the boys did it in my absence, and I won't go back on them.' At another time, he made a somber statement, to the effect that every one had weaknesses which would not bear the light, and when I responded with a warm denial, he answered, 'Yes, I don't know anybody who is straight and clean all the way through — except your father!' That playful touch took the sharpness all out. He was not a harsh judge of human nature; but he had very high ideals, and very keen eyes, so he never found people perfect.

"In matters where I differed from him most sharply, I can see now either that he was right, or that there was an allowance to

be made for his motives which I did not at the time appreciate. Once, while away from Springfield, I found in the *Republican* a full report of the trial of a libel suit which included some very repulsive testimony. I wrote to Mr. Bowles a remonstrance in very sharp terms. But before sending the letter I showed it to my wife, and she said, 'Is it worth while to send it? He has a great deal to vex him, and this will pain him, because he likes you.' Of course, after that I burned the letter. I know now that in this case the paper had told the truth about a scoundrel, who sought revenge in a libel suit; and when the testimony justified the paper and convinced the jury, he meant that the larger jury who read his paper should fully appreciate the justification. Wise or unwise,—and I still think it would have been better to suppress some of the testimony,—he didn't deserve any such vials of wrath as I was ready to pour out on him. But we are never so harsh as when we suppose we are vindicating the right; and I think that was one reason why Mr. Bowles was stoned so much by good folks who thought they were doing God service. I suspect, too, that in printing news with too little delicacy and reserve he was somewhat influenced by a sort of resentful independence toward the people who attacked him for doing it.

"I once ran against him on a corner in Boston, and he went with me to the rooms where my wife and I were staying, on our first visit to the Hub. He entered with great zest into the mixture of admiration and amusement with which we were observing the Bostonese ways. 'It's the best sort of provincialism,' he said. I hardly ever saw any one give just the sort of recognition to a woman that he did,—treating her as an intellectual equal, yet with a kind of chivalrous deference, suggested rather than expressed. His face had manly beauty; his voice was mellow and finely modulated; sincerity, intelligence, kindness, were in every look and tone.

"As I saw him, there was nothing in his bearing that suggested ill health to me until within his last year. He took me home to dinner with him one day, and as he sat at the head of the table, not even his hospitality could lift him out of the fatigue that visibly rested on him. He did not shed a depress-

ing influence on the company, but he could add little to their good cheer. Almost the last time I saw him was in June, half a year before his death, when, meeting on the street, he accepted an invitation to drive with me, and we jogged off through the pleasant country. He seemed like a very tired man,—though I did not suspect that the mainspring was worn out. I remember the affectionate way in which he spoke of Mount Tom, saying he had always wanted to live in sight of it. He talked of his occupations of the past winter, saying that aside from the paper his principal work had been in helping to start the Union Relief and to shape the new city charter. I asked what he thought of a certain citizen: 'Well,' he said, with a twinkle, 'I should describe him in Rufus Choate's words to a jury, as "a sound, substantial, serviceable — second-hand harness!"' We passed a yellow house, and he said that was his favorite color. His son has since told me: 'Father liked yellow in almost everything; he liked to wear yellow gloves; and his idea of handsome dress was to adorn himself with white trousers and yellow gloves,— then he would say, "*Voilà!*"'

"My one boyish recollection of him is at the Pequot House in New London, where he offered his carriage and span of horses to my mother for a long ride, with me as driver, though I was a mere youngster and had never driven two horses before,— and I was as much struck by his good-nature as by the grandeur of my position. Almost my last recollection is of another piece of kindness. Some western railroad had got up a journalists' excursion party,— a month's trip to Colorado, free of expense. Mr. Bowles wrote to me that if I would like to try my hand on the paper, as I had once suggested, he would let one of his young men have the trip, and I might take his desk for the month; or I was equally welcome to take the ticket and the trip myself, making not even the return of letters to the paper, except as I might fancy. I accepted the latter proposition,— though accident frustrated the plan,— and this took me to Springfield to see him. I found him on the back porch of his house, with a visitor, who presently left us, and we sat and talked as the summer twilight deepened to

darkness. Our talk ran to the higher problems of existence. He showed a deep sense of how little man can know. He made the best of what we have here,—'I have had a good time of it,—my life has been rich and full,—why should I ask for more?' The tone was of one who resolves to be content rather than of one who is content. At the end I said, 'It seems to me we must believe that this universe is governed by a power which is beyond our full comprehension, but of which the best and truest knowledge we have, the nearest approach to the reality, is in the highest qualities of human nature, such qualities as justice and benevolence. The supreme power must be like our best, and only differ from it in being better.' 'That,' he said, 'is, I think, what the best minds are coming to accept.'

"Meeting him for a moment a day or two after, he said with a shrug, 'What did you mean by getting inside my guard the other night? Why should I turn myself inside out to you?' The words expressed a half regret, half reproach, but I think their inner sense was just the opposite. He used sometimes a sort of half-ironical banter, which had a more friendly significance than compliment, and in those words I read the acceptance of a freer intimacy than had before belonged to our kindly but casual acquaintance. To have had in its fullness such a friendship as his, would have been one of the eminent good fortunes of a life-time. But when I next returned to Springfield he was not there. I had met him in all hardly more than a dozen or twenty times, but the town seemed to me to have lost half its inhabitants."

One of his women friends, Mrs. B——, writes:

"We met but rarely, but when we did meet we were friends, always and at once, understanding and trusting each other more than many who meet daily. Everybody, especially all women, felt his peculiar charm. I had known him in a way from boyhood up—but it was only in the last years of his life that I came to know him well. He talked with me freely of his home, his many friendships, and sometimes of his

difficulties, and the separations that had grown out of his political contests, which I knew he felt most keenly. It was no easy task for him to speak the truth when it wounded those he loved,— it cost him a mighty effort; it shortened his life. We often differed as to politics. Sometimes I avoided him when I thought the paper in the wrong; sometimes he avoided me. I well remember when one evening he half opened the door, saying, 'C——, I have come to spend the evening with you if we can be friendly; and I have done a good thing lately which will put you on good terms with me when you hear it'— his eyes were glowing and a beautiful smile broke all over his face. I said, 'First tell me what you have done, for I have a score laid up against you.' He came lounging into the room, seated himself with his legs over the arm of the chair and said, 'Well, I have withheld a piece of scandal about a woman's husband from the paper, because she asked it. I said to her, "But when the scoundrel comes home you will go on living with him — all women do that." She said, "I shall not"— but she'll do it all the same!' And so she did, but the paper held its peace. Then we fell to playing whist, which he laughingly said 'he played for fun, and didn't mind if he trumped his partner's ace.'

"How well I remember, when the war was over and the North triumphant, how he looked as he said, 'All I want now is to go to London, wear my best clothes, and be as *sarsy* as I please!'

"It was delightful to drive with him. His eyes were open to all the beauty about him, and he made quick response to all that you told him of yourself. Such a drive we took one lovely June day to Amherst through the gap in the mountains. We discussed all manner of subjects, all things concerning ourselves, politics, religion, and had our little turn of gossip; while the birds sang overhead, and the fields were green in the sunshine, and the shadows played over the mountains. In a meadow we saw a bed of beautiful cyclamens, and he gathered his hands full, as pleased as a child with their beauty.

"Once we drove to Blandford, and I staid for a few days in the pleasant home there. He was the life of the house — looking after everybody's comfort — making much of each child, and always forgetting himself in his interest for others.

"He was ready to hear and ready to respond to any story of a troubled life. His heart was tender, his judgment good, and his advice reliable. He was a most patient listener. Once I told him of a troubled woman, whose life seemed nearly wrecked. She was an artist. 'Of course she can be put on her feet,' said he. 'She must get away from her old surroundings, go to California, and paint the wild flowers there; and I will introduce her to my friends,' and he went on planning all the details of her life there as eagerly as if she had been his dearest friend.

"Once, as I was going home after watching all night by Mrs. Farrar's death-bed, I met him returning in the early morning from the office. He stopped to inquire about Mrs. Farrar, and stood leaning on the fence, his face on his hand, his broad hat shading it and casting a shadow on his eyes, which were full of tender solicitude. I told him of the lesson I had gained by watching the peaceful close of such a beautiful and unselfish life; and he took my hand, looked earnestly in my face, and said, 'C——, will you come and stay with me at the last?' I said, 'Do you mean it?' He said, 'Certainly I do,'—and I promised."

Some life-like touches are given in this sketch, by an anonymous writer in the Boston *Globe*, after his death:

"Mr. Bowles had the virtue — for it was a virtue, one of the most effective in the personal relations of life — of the tact and impulse to say the words suited to the person and the moment, the fructifying words which can so instantly leaven the whole lump of an inert or dissatisfied mood, turning the thought and purposes narrowed upon self into fuller and sweeter channels. I particularly remember a few words he once said to me when we unexpectedly met in the street in Springfield. I was in a mood of thorough weariness and discouragement, into which I soon felt he had dived with the keen look of his kind but piercing eyes. We spoke of bright topics only, his manner all the while emanating the silent sympathy which helps so much because it respects so much. Just at parting he took my hand. 'It does me good to see you — it always does me good,' he said.

Then, very impressively, 'See here, my friend, it is little matter what happens to us outside of our own action,—if that is true and firm, all the rest of the bother is bearable, isn't it? You are fresh and good and sweet; your bow and smile across the street is like a bouquet to me. You have the best right to be happy, because you diffuse happiness.' His words might be mere kindly compliment, and were certainly a friend's partiality, but in a spiritual sense they warmed and fed and clothed me; for what makes us so eager to deserve high and generous regard as to find that we have it?

"One hot day in July, 1876, I met him on School street in Boston. He had just come from a convention or public gathering of some sort. Noticing that he looked very weary, I inquired into the cause. 'Well,' he said, 'I am always tired, and to-day especially tired. You know I am an invalid, who can't eat everything and at any time, as other folks can. Now I've been sitting for hours among distinguished people, listening to excellent discourse; but I had a cracker in my coat pocket, which I wanted to eat and didn't dare. And I couldn't get my mind off that cracker. Two or three times I put my hand in my pocket, pretending to myself that I would take it out and eat it. But I didn't; I hadn't the courage. Picture to yourself a paragraph in the next day's "Personals": "Mr. Bowles, sitting by some curious accident among the distinguished guests on the platform, nibbling a cracker!" But,' with a laughingly rueful smile, 'it would have saved me a bad headache. What cowards we all are! How straitly and carefully we stand within the lines of limitation drawn so tyrannically around us by public opinion and custom! But then the restraint it is upon the otherwise undeveloped and ungoverned social elements! It is a general blessing, well worth the sacrifice of much individual comfort.'

"Calling on him one day, within a year, in his editorial room, I found him alone and looking very ill. He shoved back the papers, and, drawing a chair for me near his own, said, with a heavy sigh and unusually quick utterance, 'Sit down, sit down; I am glad you came in, for I am tired. Books, papers, and letters,—letters, papers, and books! It's as bad as stitch,

stitch, stitch — seam, gusset, and band. I'm not very well, and I am very cross! Not that any one ventures to tell me so,'— his features lighted suddenly with his cordial smile,—'but then I know it myself.' After a little conversation he seemed and said he was rested. He shook off his eye-glasses, and brushed back his hair, and began to speak with more than usual animation concerning his own affairs and other matters. After saying 'good-bye,' he followed me out, still talking, and at the head of the dark stair-way which frequenters of his office will remember, he clasped my hand and said 'God bless you' very heartily. It would have moved me more deeply had I known that I should never touch his hand or hear his friendly voice again.

"When riding with him one day about Springfield, whose beauties and notable features he had been pointing out with a running comment full of information and interest, he checked his horse on the summit of Crescent Hill that we might take a longer look at the scene,—city, river, and woody undulations beyond the Agawam, all wrapped in the warm glow of a rosy sunset. 'What a beautiful world it is,' said he, 'and why should man murmur at the sometime bitter when the sweet is so royally bestowed?' Then, after a pause, 'What need have we, after all, of the creeds men so ingeniously construct and so fanatically maintain? Is there any verbal creed which teaches us so much, or inspires so sure a faith, as the smooth running of that river, the foliage of those woods, the glory of the sky?' As we rode down into the city, he suddenly broke silence with these words, showing rather a sequence than a disconnection of thought: 'I'm getting old, my friend, and weather-beaten, but the children are growing up well; they will turn out fairly, I think, and that is a great thing.'"

CHAPTER LI.

The Farewell.

THE *Republican* and its editor stood in 1877 at the zenith of success. The initiation by President Hayes of a policy of reconciliation and reform marked a signal triumph of the ideas for which the paper had striven. Its fortunes, which had suffered for a time under the stress of commercial depression, were so fully retrieved that Mr. Bowles wrote in a business letter, after specifying the profits of recent years, "The paper was never in better moral or material condition." He was in his fifty-second year, naturally the ripe prime of manhood. But he had spent his capital of vitality. The tide was beginning a final ebb, which no recurrent flow was to succeed. There was nothing to sharply mark a change,—the fluctuations seemed for a while to be only such as he had rallied from before. And his face was set toward life, not death. Every interest and every tie that had held him held him still.

In the later spring of 1877 he made a journey through Virginia and Kentucky, and thence to Chicago, and in a part of it he had the company of Murat Halstead and Henry Watterson. The enjoyment yielded by new scenes and old friendships was alloyed by weakness greater than he had felt before.

To his Wife.

CINCINNATI, May —, 1877.

We have had two and a half days of very delightful and fatiguing enjoyment here — weather soft and mild — hospitality unbounded and discriminating — and very many pleasant experiences with people, outdoors, pictures and other art. We have taken but one meal, and that our first breakfast, at our hotel. I have been and am pretty well — not overflowing with vigor, but well enough to enjoy everything but the food and drink; and that is a great deal. I have seen Dr. Bartholo, and got some useful hints and cautions from him. This afternoon we go over to Louisville, Mr. Halstead with us. We stay with Mr. Watterson; to-morrow morning we breakfast with Mr. Bristow, who lives in Louisville; and then Mr. Watterson takes us in an open carriage through the pleasantest parts of Kentucky for three days. Friday or Saturday I shall go over to Chicago and be at Palmer House — stay there two days, and then go homeward *via* Cleveland, Auburn, and Syracuse, reaching Springfield the last of next or the first of week after next.

ROCHESTER, May —, 1877.

I haven't written more, because when time allowed strength failed. My telegrams have, however, kept you advised. I don't think I shall have a chance to see Geneva again before I die, and so am going to pass a few hours there to-morrow.

I have had the usual experience, only more so, — so much dyspepsia and weariness as to spoil the vacation of most of its pleasure, — and leaving as the chief comfort of it the anticipation that I shall be a great deal better for it all after I get home. I have traveled very slowly, and taken the utmost care of my diet, but it doesn't seem to lessen the distress of my malady. I know, however, I am gaining strength, and I certainly have had an interesting and very instructive time; but I am about ready to put my foot down against any more journeys of any sort. I shall be very glad to be home again with you all — and I send great love.

To Murat Halstead.

June 12, 1877.

DEAR OLD SILVER DOLLAR:

How are you? How about Paris and around the world?

I came back a good deal discouraged at my incapacity in stomach and head for travel, and the give and take of life; but it was one of the most interesting experiences I ever had, and after I get the Kentucky milk out of my system, perhaps I shall be the better for it. Perhaps the two best things were the enlarged and deepened view of Cincinnati and its culture, and the increased capacity I discovered in you for shirking work and leaving others to bear the heat and burden of the day and night.

I see you have converted Hayes to "the dollar of the daddies." But I am afraid it is only till after the October election, and then he will make a compromise that will be accepted by the gold barons. It looks to me as if you would save Ohio, but the thing that will do it will be a courageous acceptance of the President's position and policy — a going ahead, and not back. The silver dollar will do to fool with, but that is about all.

To Henry Watterson.

June —, 1877.

The Nashville address was a great success. The North is all reading it, loving you for it, and, what is better, appreciating you and your people more intelligently. I think you have said as good things before in some of your congressional speeches — possibly even better. But this has the great advantage of coming at the right moment to be widely received and honestly judged. You see, we printed it in both Daily and Weekly in full. It is *the* address of the week and will do all the good you have dreamed it might do.

My week in Kentucky is one of the most memorable and delightful in all my experience. I owe it all to your loving friendship and generous hospitality — all the more tender and generous that I am such a valetudinarian that I could not seem responsive or even appreciative of it at the time. It was the tragedy of this whole vacation trip that it revealed to me so

sharply how little I could stand of fatigue or irregularity. I saw all you had told me of Kentucky and its people — their large gifts and possessions, and their provincial limitations. But I saw more than I had previously realized what a great work you have been doing for them, and how great your opportunity for still greater work is. There was nothing so sweet to me in all my Kentucky intercourse as to find the best Republicans testifying to both the patriotism and practicality of your labors and influence. I will never quarrel with you as Bourbon any more, but I shall quarrel with you if you do not put away childish things and buckle down seriously to your great opportunity. Not that I am like the fox who having his tail cut off wants all the rest of the foxes to shed theirs,—I would rather, on the contrary, grow my own,—but because I am miserly of such power as you possess, and not willing to see any of it wasted. You have, my dear fellow, no superabundance of physical power, like Halstead, and you cannot afford to be extravagant with it. Pardon all this for affection's sake. I wanted two more days in Kentucky to be spent quietly at Louisville and get acquainted with your sweet wife, and the great Haldeman, for whom as one of the Nestors in journalism I have great regard, and would know him more and better. I will come again some time and do just those things.

What a delicious fellow Stoddard Johnston is! He is one of the most exquisite human revelations I ever had, and worth going to Kentucky and denying myself Bourbon whisky to get acquainted with.

*To Murat Halstead.**

Your silver policy depends for its righteousness on the truth of your theory that the depreciation in silver as compared with gold is more the result of its demonetization than overproduction. That, I suppose, is an open question. For its success as a policy it depends on your ability to convert the Republican party of the nation to your view. It looks to me, now, as if

* The undated letters in this chapter — belonging to the summer and autumn of 1877 — are copied from the short-hand notes in which they were taken down by Mr. Bowles's secretary from his dictation.

you had created the demand, the yielding to which you say is essential to Republican success in Ohio, and that if you succeed in your first undertaking and save Ohio, you will do it at the expense of Hayes and the Republican party elsewhere. It would be a little odd if M. Halstead, Esq., after having saved the Republicans two years running, should now be the direct architect of their ruin. As I care a great deal more about Halstead than I do about the Republican party, I shall be able to bear this contingency with a good deal of sweet philosophy.

I have been a good deal discouraged since I came back from the West about myself — perhaps never more so. But I am working into a little better shape, and I had four columns in the *Republican* this morning. It looks as if the constitution had gone, but the by-laws are pretty tough.

Four columns of writing in a single paper! That was all the response he made to Nature's danger-signal.

To Carl Schurz.

You may like to read what I say of father Adams's last. It looks as if there was to be a sharp change. The politicians on both sides are uniting to break down Hayes. Will he reach out for the people on both sides? Will the people on both sides reach out to sustain him? That's the point. I saw a good deal of Spofford of Louisiana last week. I think he is to be a power in the new politics and in the Senate. He is ready for the new dispensation, and will go with Hayes, if Hayes gives him a chance. He seems to me to be one of the very best of the men from the South, a fine orator, with a clean-cut perception of the political facts of the situation and a patriotic desire to serve all. I have not been so impressed by a new man for a long time.

I am so vexed with you and myself too that Cabot Lodge isn't your assistant secretary. I thought of him when you were looking for one, but thought he would not accept, and so did not speak of it. And now I find he would have been glad to. Nobody could have been better for you. We need to import into the Departments just such men — fellows who have the

working temperament as he has, who have high patriotic purposes, and while independent of their salaries will abundantly earn them. With such a man at your right hand, you would have simply doubled yourself, while you could have had the benefit of all the other kind of material in the next place below.

I hope you keep in good heart and hope. The theory of civil-service reform at Washington is beautiful, but the practice is often pretty bad. But the comfort is that it seems to me that you have gone so far you cannot go back,— that you must go through and find still waters beyond.

I am pretty feeble of body this summer, but tolerably brave of soul, and I am always heartily yours.

To President Hayes.

Many thanks for your note, and for its most agreeable information. It is only just to the *Republican* to say, however, that what it stated came to me weeks ago on the authority of General Boynton, but was not published until it was found in the Boston *Herald's* Washington correspondence. The paper will, of course, correct the wrong impression with great pleasure.

There is no trouble in getting on with Butler. He is just as well content with half a loaf as he would be with the whole, and when he has none he is powerless. It is like what one of the Adams boys said of David Dudley Field, that he had a great reputation in England because he was supposed to be the leading lawyer of America, and that he was thought to be a great lawyer in America because he had such an English reputation. Butler has been powerful at Washington because he was supposed to be powerful in Massachusetts, and his power in Massachusetts rested on his success at Washington.

Amid the clamor of politicians and office-seekers at Washington, I hope you will never forget that outside are the great body of the people of both parties, who ask nothing but good government, like what they have got from you so far. I never knew the public mind more malleable, more ready to follow

courageous lead in your direction, more rapidly being educated in the true gospel of reform. If the Republicans can only be brought to challenge an issue upon the Administration and its undertakings, I cannot doubt their success in all the pending elections.

To Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler.

Just what we shall bring out of our Union Relief Association here is uncertain. But I am so happy at having the experiment begun, after laboring ever since you gave me the impulse, years ago, that I am not in the mood to be impatient with any imperfections or hesitations. There is plenty of zeal, but there is scant knowledge, and our danger is that the public respect and faith will be lost through disgust at ignorant zeal and lame administration. The three or four best people we have here in the business are women, but they have insisted so far on keeping in the background and pushing the men forward,—quite against my protest.* I think they will have to come to the front, however, for the lack of finding the men who have both the leisure and the capacity for the work. We have a rather remarkable woman here in Mrs. N. A. Leonard. She has had great influence in the state upon our charitable legislation, and may be said, indeed, now to exercise as much power and to be held in as much respect on all this class of questions as anybody in the commonwealth. But she is an invalid, and between this and her family cares finds it necessary to avoid very much of active labor. She is a person, however, whom you should know and be in correspondence with.

The *Republican* keeps all this class of themes prominent in its attention and treatment. It is almost, indeed, an organ of charity and prison reform — largely through Mr. Sanborn's connection with the paper, and partly from my long-time recognition of the importance of all this sort of questions. You

* It is safe to say that, if Mr. Bowles had lived a little longer, the association could not have maintained, against the shafts of his criticism, the absurdity of excluding women from all share in its governmental administration.

may have observed that the state has an authorized board of women visitors to the prisons and charitable institutions. Also we are to have a special state commission this year for the review and revision of our laws on the whole subject.

To Carl Schurz.

A good deal has happened lately besides the burning of some of your old rat-traps [by a fire in the Patent Office]. When I think of how much I have suffered in going through those dreary halls, and how many generations yet unborn are exposed to suffering, I seriously lament that the whole collection wasn't consumed.

Didn't we do you up proud in Massachusetts? We even surprised ourselves, and yet there is very general acquiescence. If we only had a good candidate for governor, on the right side of the local issues as we have of the general, we would show you an old-fashioned majority enough. As it is, the old platform will pull Rice through quite respectably.

Poor Conkling! Providence has left it to him to lead the forlorn hope of the machine. But it simplifies things wonderfully, provided Evarts has sense enough not to set up a gang.

To Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker.

There can be no mistaking the *Courant's* piece as Hawley's. It was full of his ear-marks. He was very smart, but it wasn't sense or reason. In the first place, the *Republican* isn't pursuing Conkling, but on the other hand doing all it can to save him to the Republican party; Hawley erected a man of straw and then pummeled it in his pugilistic fashion. What there was of reason in his piece is covered by this paragraph from the *Republican*. His rhetoric we cannot begin to match up here!

The past always comes to us with a halo. Webster was an awful big man, but he was as much wrecked by his ambition as any of our modern and lesser statesmen. Conkling's qualities are more like those of Sumner. He lacks the high moral convictions and proportions, and New York politics have made

him of questionable political integrity, but his great personal pride and vanity are a shield from personal dishonor. I am afraid he is doomed to wreck himself on his passion and his prejudices, to ruin because he cannot rule; but he is a nobler man than Evarts or than Wheeler or than Fenton, or any other of the brood of New York statesmen, save George William Curtis.

To G. W. Smalley.

July 9, 1877.

When you were here last year, you found out that the Boston *Herald* was not only the most successful piece of journalism in New England, but (always after the Springfield *Republican!)* the most independent and the most efficient for the right thing and the right men.

Here is the man who does it, my friend Mr. E. B. Haskell, a journalist of long training, a gentleman of the best instincts, and a friend whom I greatly value. There is a very sweet woman with him whom he has the honor to call his wife, and a dreadful clever fellow for a minister, Rev. Francis Tiffany, who built the house I live in, and to whom I owe besides a considerable part of whatever educated goodness there is in me.

To H. L. Dawes.

September 10, 1877.

I don't think a fellow who like you was throwing up his cap for a Southern Democrat and rebel in President Hayes's cabinet so long ago as last February, has any reason to make nice distinctions with me on the reconstruction of parties. When you sought and hailed Key in the cabinet, you gave up the whole question. I don't care one bit about reconstruction of parties *per se.* All I want is the results, and I had as lief they would come one way as another — without reconstruction, with a little reconstruction, or with a great deal. But the fact is, the Republican party is in a minority in the country. It has got to get into a majority. Hayes has led in the only way now possible to get that majority, and you fellows who are hesitating in following him, or seeking to make terms with his leader-

ship, are only lessening the chances of achieving that majority, or of achieving it under the leadership and control of the Republican party. I don't see anything to be gained now by digging up the skeleton of the Democracy and kicking it. I do see a great deal to be gained by rallying round Hayes, and inviting everybody else to do the same.— and among the everybody else it will be necessary to include some Democrats, North and South, or you won't get the majority. That's about all there is in it.

For myself, I am uncommonly well satisfied with the situation. The procession is moving, and I am sitting by and clapping my hands, metaphorically,— eating peanuts and drinking cider. The most I want is to see you somewhere near the head of the column.

From his letters at this time one could hardly infer any change in him, but there had come to be a difference in his habitual bearing, which was recognized by those who loved him well or who watched him closely. "The old air of audacity was gone," says one friend; "he looked languid, and as if the fight was all out of him." Says another: "During his last two or three years, it seemed to me that he specially wanted to be in peace and friendship with all his neighbors,— he was tired of fighting." The members of his staff felt an unaccustomed gentleness in him. One of them, to whom his dominating presence had been sometimes an inspiration and sometimes a pain, says of this time: "During the whole of his last year nothing could be sweeter than his manner, always. Some of us spoke of it to each other with alarm; it wasn't quite natural. I told my wife I wanted to see some of Mr. Bowles's ugliness; I was afraid he was going to die.— I had not been used to hearing him speak of nature, though I could see that he greatly enjoyed it. But during this year — and the summer and autumn of 1877 were exceedingly beautiful — he never spoke with me without alluding to the loveliness of the world."

In midsummer — in the midst of jocose letters to "Old Silver Dollar," editorials defending the Hayes administration, cares of politics, of newspaper, of business — this note was written to a woman friend:

It was very sweet to see you at last. I hope I may oftener come face to face with you. I have little spare strength or time for writing and so testifying to my remembrance, and you are very good to like me so much and to say such sweet and encouraging things to me. I think I may be depended on to the extent of my power and as long as I stay. And it helps me to stay to know that there are those who want me and depend on me, even in the distant unpractical way that is after all the best intercourse of most of us, and certainly all that is left to us.

I spoke to you of "Warrington's" revelations of immortality at the close. They were greatly impressive to me. Here is the record. You may like to read it, even from an enemy.

The passage referred to is given in the memoir of "Warrington" by his wife. That life-long fighter spent his last days in a sort of radiant peace. From the reverent uncertainty respecting a future life which had been his habit, he passed, as the end drew near, into the serenest assurance, and his mental vision was filled with the familiar figures and faces of those who, having gone before, seemed to revisit and welcome him.

It was the thronging interests and pressing responsibilities of the present which filled Mr. Bowles's mind. This summer saw the paper tested as to its editorial conduct in an emergency, in the chief's absence. He was away at Saratoga, when a strike broke out among the employees of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, on the occasion of a reduction of wages, and spread like wildfire until all trans-continental communication was interrupted. The lowest population of the great cities, from Baltimore to Chicago, rose in ferment and mischief, and

for a few days no one knew how far the trouble might spread. The *Republican* was among the very few journals which kept their heads and showed no touch of panic. It urged the sharpest measures against the mob; it pointed out that a reduction of wages was a necessary part of the shrinkage which all business values were undergoing; it had not the least fear of any general upheaval of society; and its tone helped to steady the nerves of New England, which proved firm enough to resist the infection of the tumult. When the rioters had been subdued, and the strike had failed, the paper urged the duties of corporations to their workmen, and of the richer to the poorer class, as clearly and emphatically as it had rebuked the mob. It described intelligently and without exaggeration the spread of communistic ideas among the foreign element in the population. Its tone toward the various social classes maintained the same fairness it had practiced toward political parties. When Mr. Bowles returned, he gave his lieutenants that word of praise which was their highest reward. Well might he be gratified,—the problems of the coming generation had begun to press, and his pupils had shown themselves true to his training.

The summer brought to him some special anxieties, including a recurrence of his wife's chronic malady, in a severe and protracted recurrence of asthma, and also an unusual pressure of business cares. When his daughter came home in September, she was struck by his increased weakness. He said playfully, "I shall have to have a valet; I can hardly brush my hair without sitting down." Dr. S. W. Bowles falling in with him at about this time, there was a long talk between them about his health; there were difficulties of the stomach and liver, but all ran back to a common cause—nervous exhaustion. He gradually became anxious about his condition,

and, hearing from some friend a warm recommendation of Dr. Wier Mitchell, of Philadelphia, he went to consult him. He spent a few days under his care, and received full directions for a course of treatment, of which the main features were entire rest and abundance of nutritious food. He came home somewhat the worse for a cold taken on the journey; and, following out the prescribed course, went to bed for a time, about the 12th of October. His regular physician, Dr. Smith, was in close attendance on him. No absolute seclusion from company or business was attempted; there was a little visiting by friends, and a little dictation to his secretary. He could not keep his hands from the paper. A month of this quiescence yielding no evident gain, a variation was tried by getting up daily for a little while, and occasionally riding out; but still there was a slow loss of ground.

These are some of the letters from his sick-room:

To Henry M. Spofford.

So you have found out that Washington is not the place to indulge one's admiring gaze upon the workings of our noble institution. It is rather like the top of a boil on the human system — the very center and heart of all the worst elements in the political body. The average congressman is a person most terribly conscious of the provincialism of his district, and Congress is simply an aggregate seething and struggling of a great number of localisms — rarely or never losing themselves in the stream of national or patriotic feeling.

If there are any Southern Democrats who are really serious and intelligent in their desire to obliterate past controversies and reach forward to new interests and new divisions, they have certainly missed an opportunity, perhaps *the* opportunity, for their work. A dozen such men in Congress responding to President Hayes's leadership, and declaring their preference for following him rather than their old party banner, would

to-day witness the practical revolution of American politics. But all of you seem to care a good deal more about maintaining the old Democratic party and creeping back into power through and by and with it than you do for anything else; and Dick Taylor going about the country exhorting the brethren to stand to the old standards, and make sure of a Tilden or a Hendricks or a Thurman or some worse Bourbon in 1880, is, I fear, the type of the dominant temper of even the best people of the South. It is as mischievous as Jeff Davis's leadership in 1860; and if it succeeds — as I don't yet believe it possibly can — it will simply perpetuate the old discords, the old jealousies and distrusts, and carry the country on through another four years of the old bitter sectional division and temper. Everybody seems to be afraid of his own constituency and his own reëlection, nobody daring to trust to the instincts of his own patriotism and to believe that the people are ready to follow the call of the new gospel.

Well, I won't scold any more. I am shut up in the house with my increased maladies, and have no safety-valve except an occasional grumble. I hope you will pull through [*i. e.*, be admitted as senator from Louisiana], because I believe in you and am sure you deserve to; but you will have your brethren to thank if you don't.

. . . Yes, I know very well what the Republican party — name and thing alike — must stand for in the South. But consider what the best ten or twelve per cent. of the Republican party did in 1872, under no other motive than patriotism and love of justice and truth,—deserted their old standard, joined their hated enemy, and made fight for justice to the South. Again, last year, quite as many of them voted for Tilden. Now, the thing we all wanted has come through a nominally Republican but really national President — almost more than we could have hoped for; more, practically, than Tilden could have given. Interest and patriotism alike exact of the Southern people that they shall seize this opportunity, and practically close the old era and open the new. There is no occasion for gratitude. All that the opportunity asks of you is to be sensible,

selfish, and practical. It will be an awful piece of stupidity if there are not Southern Democrats enough in Congress to rise up and say: "This Congress shall not be organized and run in opposition to what this man at the White House is doing. We don't mean to join the Republican party, we give no assurances where we will be or how we will vote in 1880, but this man is doing the right thing now, and we are not only not going to stand in his way, but we are going to help him."

Of course there are lots of drawbacks, personal and political, many bad appointments, hesitation here and backsliding there, but the main current is set in the right direction, and success will carry it along and in all good time lead the Administration out of its inconsistencies, out of its obligations to the corrupt and cheap men of the old Republican party, and force it to recognize the best men everywhere. Hayes is slow in some respects, provokingly so, and very careful to protect his rear, but it looks to me as if he was sure; and certainly he is not only our best hope but our only hope, now, for political improvement, and the more the independent and true men of all sections and all parties rally around him, the more sure he will be to go ahead in the right path.

Lest you may have missed Hoar's speech at the Worcester convention and the resolutions in full, I send them to you. Only three weeks before, Hoar declined to preside because he thought he could not come up to the Administration standard. He saw Evarts and the President, had light, and went in.

I hope I shall see you when you come North. I am a good deal knocked up yet with my maladies, and don't get away much, but expect to be around for some time to come yet.

To George D. Robinson, just beginning his first term as congressman, he wrote:

I hope you will find Washington agreeable. To me it is a very trying place. I always get sick and disgusted there. It is like going into the green-room of a theater, and takes away the illusions of the stage.

I congratulate you that you early planted yourself on the President's side. I see no leadership in our present politics

worthy of respect but his, and it is astonishing to me that men of sense and patriotism on both sides hold out so obstinately in their old partisanship against it.

To D. W. Bartlett.

If you have not made the acquaintance of the new congressman from this district, Robinson, pray go to him and introduce yourself in my name. He followed Dawes's example last year, and let the Blaine machine take possession of this district in its representation at Cincinnati, and got his nomination to Congress in part return. This obliged the *Republican* to oppose him. But at heart, as he has since shown himself, he belongs to the best and reform wing of the party, and I think will justify this reputation in the future. He is a man of good culture, thoroughly good habits and character, a genuine New Englander in spirit and training, faithful and industrious, and likely to make a successful and long-continued congressman.

To Charles Nordhoff.

By and by, if I can worry along into tolerable strength and bear other folks' victual, I am going off — say in midwinter — to the south of England or the Bermudas or Bahamas. But that is only a dream now. For the present I am simply saving my boots and shoes and clothes by lying in bed.

To Rev. Francis Tiffany.

November 6, 1877.

It was like a north-west wind in summer to get your cheery little letter of interest and memory. For my sin of running away from the Unitarian ministers I had to go to bed as soon as I got back, and I am here still. At the bottom it is prostration of the nerve power of the stomach, affecting the breathing apparatus and the heart, added to which was for a time some bronchial trouble. I am slowly getting better; there is no organic trouble, and if I can lie here long enough and eat good victuals enough and let life inside accumulate, they tell me I shall get over it. That is about all there is to it.

I was sure you would have a pleasant summer with the Haskells. They are dreadful good fellows, both of them! But I couldn't have kept up with your gait. I am the chap for "the bank where the wild thyme grows," with one other fellow, male or female, lying in the sunshine, picking flowers to pieces, and discoursing on the frivolity of things we cannot do!

You must have made this chamber especially for me to be sick in. I have the sun from the rising to the going down thereof. I look out upon noble chestnuts and maples and oaks. Through their falling leaves I see the houses of hospitable neighbors, and the spires of churches I don't go to; and far beyond, the brown hills I mean to go to next summer. Within, there is the open fire-place you built, and the flame of a birch-wood fire — when the wood isn't green! And on the whole I am having a pretty good time for such a miserable sinner. You see I can be long-winded on paper, in spite of the short wind that oppresses me and is the pregnant obstinate fact of the situation.

To Miss Whitney.

. . . The general program for the future is a continuance in bed. It has its cheerful side and I trust its beneficial one as well. I see a little company from the office and from society, and do a very little dictating, but it can hardly be called an industrious life.

I have at last got your delayed interest from Colorado, so you no longer owe me anything save your undying affection — and a small matter of interest, which I will come up and board out as soon as I get well enough.

These letters show his prevailing tone in these weeks when life was ebbing slowly and as yet indecisively,— a tone of cheerful courage as to himself, and the wonted lively interest in his friends and in the doings of the great world. He recognized the possible issue of his illness, but said very little about it, except by way of setting his house in order. One morning he gave to his secretary directions for writing his will. Later in the

day the secretary returned with the will drawn up, and he then signed it with the witnesses. His bearing as he did it was more than composed; there was an entire cheerfulness of manner which pervaded the little company, and banished from the scene any air of mournfulness.

Charles Dudley Warner wrote as follows of his last interview with him:

"'Nothing is the matter with me,' he said, with the old smile, 'but thirty-five years of hard work.' It was only a question whether absolute rest and good nourishment could restore sufficient vigor to the vital organs. We spoke of travel, and the climate of the south of England, when he should be able to rally a little. 'No,' he said, 'it has come to this, the battle must be fought out in this chamber, and the result is more than doubtful.' He did not show in his face the weakness of his frame; his eye was clear and strong, and beamed with the old affectionate warmth and the well-known half-cynical humor. He was entirely cheerful, and faced his situation with serene courage. We talked much of the friends who were dear to him, and he spoke of them in terms of unrestrained and loving enthusiasm. Nor was there the slightest trace of bitterness in regard to others whose attitude latterly had been unfriendly. His interest in our national affairs, in politics and the literature of the day, was keen and unabated, but he seemed to regard the world with an access of philosophical calmness. Yet his critical faculty had not at all departed from him, nor his shrewd and sharp reading of motives and purposes. You would say that his mind had the level purpose of being just to others and just to himself. He would not allow any self-deception. 'My work is probably done,' he remarked, 'there are some things I should like to live for, but I think my work is done.'"

Mr. Dawes wrote, after his death, of a meeting which both men felt to be their last, though they did not put the feeling in words:

"At the close of a long and tender interview by his bedside, with one hand in his and the other on the latch of the door, I

received there his farewell words: 'Drop on your knees, Dawes, and thank God you have done a little good in this world, and ask his forgiveness that you have done no more!'"

Another of his old friends, Mrs. B——, writes:

"The first time I saw him after he was confined to his room was late in October. He was pale and thin, but the light in his eyes was clear and steady and his voice was strong. He was certainly very weak, for when his wife brought him his food he did not attempt to take it in his own hand, but was fed by mouthfuls. He talked freely to me of his life — of the work he had done and of what he had hoped to do; but one could see that his day was far spent, — the evening shadows were even then gathering around him, and he felt the twilight. He said he had never been ambitious for name or fame; that he felt a work had been given him to do — that it was only partly done, and so perhaps he must leave it for other hands to finish. There were tears in his eyes and in his voice. The sweet October sunshine was streaming through the room and over him. As he lay in his bed he could see the sun rise and set, could look far away over the meadows to the distant hills, and catch now and then a glimpse of the shining river. The oak-trees were reddening about his house, and the maples were flaming in scarlet and gold. I had my hands full of bright leaves which I had gathered in the cemetery. His face grew radiant as he spoke of the beauty all about him. I saw him again after a few weeks; he had just returned from a drive, and was very pale and tired. He pressed my hand warmly, but he did not try to talk — the shadows had deepened, and there was less light in his face."

But there was still hope of recovery. Dr. Smith spoke encouragingly to Mrs. Hooker of her father's condition, and bade her go with her family on a Southern journey, which health required, in good hope for him; the prospect was fair, he thought, of an easy winter. But on the first day of December, at one o'clock in the morning,

he suddenly became greatly prostrated, and unable to articulate distinctly. Dr. Smith and Dr. Bowles were summoned, and they pronounced it an attack of serous apoplexy — an effusion of water on the brain, affecting the power of speech and of swallowing, but not the mental functions, and combined with partial paralysis of the right side. Within two hours he partly regained his speech. He felt that the end was at hand. He said, "I guess my work is done; I think I might have done a little more, but I am ready to go now." Being asked if he was afraid to die, he shook his head very emphatically and said, with great positiveness, "No, not at all." He took a tender farewell of each one of his family. Only the eldest daughter was absent. He asked for her picture, and pressed it to his heart; he vainly tried to write with his own hand a message to her,— he murmured, "She understood me." Presently in his most characteristic manner he said to those who stood about him: "I am going, but not quite yet; you are in too much of a hurry!" The gray light of the morning found life rallying its forces a little. That day friends came to see him; among them were Mr. and Mrs. Alexander, Miss Whitney, and Charles Allen. With speech still difficult and imperfect, he had long conversations with his eldest son, during the day and the next night, as to the family, the paper, and business concerns. He said that, like Charles the Second, he ought to beg pardon for being "so unconscionable a time in dying," and welcomed any sign of an imminent end.

In the days and weeks that followed, messages of friendship poured in from all parts of the country. Among them was a letter from General Butler, expressing cordial regard and good wishes. The sick man's face brightened, and he said, articulating with difficulty: "Write to thank General Butler, and say that while Mr.

Bowles has always differed from him in politics, he has never failed to recognize his high qualities, and to appreciate his many personal attractions."

For some weeks there was a slight gain; then came a second paralytic shock; but only the third was fatal. The ordeal of these last weeks was a bitter one. The will that hitherto had braved and conquered everything, but was powerless at last, laid its strong behests on those who could not obey,— on the body that could no longer serve, on the friends and physicians who were powerless to help. There was no fretful repining, but there was the look of appeal that could brook no denial. Dr. Smith was a man of immense will-power, a physician who many times in an emergency had almost raised a patient from the grave by the sheer energy of his spirit. But this patient seemed to dominate him, and he would come from the sick-room with a look of defeat and almost of heart-break, in his inability to satisfy or to quiet the dumb appeal for help.

Mrs. B——, whom he had once asked to be with him at the last, was skilled in nursing the sick, and it had been an old wish of his that she should come to him if he ever needed a nurse outside of his own family. She was now brought in to help in the care of him, until at the end of a fortnight she gave place to a professional nurse.

"For two weeks," she writes, "I was with him a good deal by day and night. He was very grateful, very affectionate, and he often told me he loved to have me take care of him. I have never seen such suffering nor such appeal for help. Every nerve in the poor worn-out body seemed to come to the surface and clamor for help. His face was like a suffering child's or a wounded animal's, and behind that was the man's nature trying to fight it out. It was a comfort to stand by the hour and try to give him one moment of ease. He never

gave up the care of himself,—watched himself by day and night, watched his medicine and food and the temperature of the room as though he had nobody to care for him. One person fed him, another had charge of the fire, and so on; and yet in spite of it all he trusted nobody wholly,—the old habit staid by him to the end. Once he tried to send a message by me to my husband and Mr. Leonard,—it was a message of farewell,—and he could not do it. I have never seen a person in whom the love of life was so strong. He watched the faces of his friends with an intense eagerness, questioned the doctors, and when he could get no assurance he seemed to despair.

"At the same time that I was taking care of him, I was attending to a family as a visitor for the Union Relief Association. The father was dying of consumption; the mother trying to support her four children, her sick husband, and herself, by working in a silk factory. They were Catholics,—the man a very devout one, but the form of his faith made no difference between us. The first time I went there I found him shivering over the fire, with a beautiful baby in his arms. He had been a railroad engineer. Like Mr. Bowles, he was very proud and independent, and they had chosen to struggle on by themselves rather than go to the poor-house. He talked bravely and cheerfully with me; only when he looked at the lovely baby he said, 'It is killing my child to be so much with me. The doctor says its lungs are already affected by it.' It was true; slowly the little life faded out, and it lay in its crib at the foot of its father's bed, patient and quiet, while he as patiently waited for the end to come to him. I was there a great deal, often sitting with him for an hour or two at a time. He told me all the story of his early life in England,—of the meeting with his wife and their marriage, of the coming to this country, and the comfort they had till sickness came and one thing after another was sold and they had nothing left. It happened that his room had the same exposure as Mr. Bowles's, and he too lay in his poor bed and watched the sunshine over the same meadows, and loved it too as dearly as Sam did, and to him it brought comfort and peace. He was always cheerful, always grateful, and steady with a faith that dwelt on the un-

seen. By and by the baby died, and the little pale body was neatly dressed, and still lay in the crib at the father's feet. He said, 'You know I want to look on it as long as I can.' He was very lonely after that, and failed rapidly. One afternoon I went to see him, and found that the end was very near. He knew it as well, and when I was about to leave him he thanked me most warmly for what I had done for him. I told him of my debt of gratitude to him,—how his brave cheerfulness had strengthened me, and that if I had helped him I had been more than recompensed. He pressed my hand and said, 'You may be sure that in another world there will be always one soul praying for you.' The contrast was striking; it was at his bedside I gained the strength I needed for the other."

Nature has her inexorable code of penalties. The life that has been worn out by an over-use of the brain is perhaps never allowed to feel at the close that serenity of spirit which sometimes comes. No courage or faith can inspire cheer under repeated attacks of paralysis. And, even were the bodily conditions favorable, when a man has learned to live by will but not by trust, the inevitable surrender cannot be to him the glad yielding as of a child to its mother's embrace.

Once, in the earlier part of Mr. Bowles's illness, his wife spoke to him with regret of a friend who did not believe in immortality. He said, "That will all come right, upon the loss of a near and dear friend." In saying this he was hardly speaking out of his own experience, which had been unusual, for a man of his years and his warm and many friendships, in his exemption from severe bereavements. Death had never deprived him of wife or child, or of any one who was an intimate part of his personal life; and, spared from that supreme sorrow, he had missed too that sense it sometimes yields whereby the unknown beyond takes on a homelike warmth and a profound attraction. He had

been so closely occupied by the cares and responsibilities of the present, that outreaching imagination and desire had laid little hold on any unseen or future sphere. He would die courageously, when he must; he had no desire to drag on as a wreck; but his hands held with their last strength to the world he was leaving. His attitude toward death was like Dr. Johnson's when he said, "I will be conquered; I will not capitulate." But he showed no such horror of death as Dr. Johnson had. What he seemed to feel was not so much fear of death as absorption in this life. His thoughts and feelings had their familiar home in "the warm precincts of the cheerful day." The loves, the interests, the hopes, of this present life were closely interlinked with his whole being. Every fiber of him seemed to clasp the well-known realities. He was like one who stands on the shore with his face toward the land, toward the fields the foot has often trod, the chimney-smokes that tell of friendly hearthstones, the scenes where the heart has found its work and joy and home,— while yet he must go forth upon the unknown and mysterious sea.

After the first paralytic stroke his condition seemed to intensify his grasp upon all the cares and responsibilities which it had been his habit to carry. He threw the very last of his strength into the ordering of affairs after his death. In his earlier sickness he had minutely planned the future conduct of the newspaper, assigning to each of the staff his special work, arranging the duties and salaries of each, even in detail. He now made still more precise and scrupulous provisions for the management of the paper and also of his personal estate. Again and again he recurred with laborious care to each circumstance and contingency that could be foreseen. It seems to be sometimes an incident of paralytic disorders, that the previous strong habit of the mind asserts itself per-

sistently and, as it were, automatically. A striking instance is that of Sir Walter Scott, who, after the last of his published works was written, and under the express and understood danger not only of death but of imbecility, could not desist from attempts at romance-writing. The unintermitted habit of Mr. Bowles's life had been care-taking, and now under the body's infirmity that habit asserted itself tyrannously.

After the night of the first attack there was scarcely a spoken word of farewell. It seemed that toward those who were nearest he could not trust himself for any leave-taking. Toward two men, dear to him but not his closest intimates, he gave way in a burst of expression. Each of them, as he was going away after an unspoken farewell, was caught to his heart and held there for a few moments in a passionate embrace.

To the last he responded to the charm of Nature. The first morning sunbeams fell upon his bed, and at the wonder and beauty of the new day he never failed to brighten.

On the evening of the sixteenth of January came the final paralytic stroke. There was a very brief time of suffering, then the merciful anæsthetic,— and the conflict was over. In his passing away he was like a child whose long day of play has so tired him that he struggles against sleep, till, in spite of himself, he is folded in its tender embrace. So into reluctant hands Life pressed its last, best gift.

CHAPTER LII.

In Memoriam.

AT the funeral of George T. Davis, of Greenfield, it happened that after the services a number of his friends were gathered in a group in the cemetery, and sitting there for an hour, one after another in turn related some personal reminiscence of their friend. Among them was Mr. Bowles, and the memory of this scene suggested to him the kind of friendly commemoration which he desired for himself. According to his wish the burial service was a quiet and simple one. A few friends gathered at the house; there were singing, reading of Scripture, and prayer; and, borne by the hands of workers on the *Republican*, his body was laid at rest in the beautiful cemetery close at hand. A few days later, January 23, a memorial service was held in the Church of the Unity. A large company came together, many of them from other towns, including not a few public men and journalists. Mr. Bowles's friend and fellow-townsman, A. D. Briggs, presided over the meeting; the Scriptural reading and prayer were by Dr. William Rice and Rev. Washington Gladden; and the speakers were Charles Dudley Warner, General Hawley, Dr. Holland, Rev. Francis Tiffany, Prof. Francis Wayland, Murat Halstead, Frank W. Bird, Charles F. Adams, Jr., and George M. Stearns. Letters were read from

Miss Anna C. Brackett, the elder Charles F. Adams, Mr. Dawes, Carl Schurz, Gov. Hubbard, and Horace White. In the speeches and letters there was a warmth, a sincerity, a vivid individuality, which seemed to reflect and portray the warm, sincere, and vivid man.

The fullest estimate of his place in journalism was given by Horace White. Mr. White described the typical newspaper of fifty years before, the vehicle merely of heavy and partisan debate; the innovations of Bennett, in giving news; the union of the news-gatherer and the party politician, as in Greeley and Raymond; and the development of another school, "of which," he wrote, "our departed friend was the most illustrious type,— a school whose aim is not to get one's self, or one's friend, or one's party elected to office, but to promote a sound political education in the community, and at the same time to present in attractive form all the news that good taste and public morals can call for and justify, and no more." After noting the growth of independent sentiment for ten years following the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson, Mr. White continued:

"Let me add, what all of you can testify, that Mr. Bowles was the pioneer and leader of independent journalism in the United States. He made the experiment in an interior town, in the midst of a population overwhelmingly Republican in politics. He made it under the most adverse circumstances, against the most inveterate prejudices, and yet with the most triumphant success. . . . The truth, as he understood it, welled up within him, and must be uttered at all pains and costs — else he could not discharge the duty he owed the public as buyers and readers of his journal. Private friendship had to give way to this supreme duty, if it stood in the way. He could not grow crooked, nor could he cease to grow. . . . As Mr. Bowles was a model of what I conceive to be the highest aims of journalism, so was he a prince of the journalistic art. No American journal during the last ten or twenty years has been

more diligently studied by editors than the Springfield *Republican*. This is the crucial test of a public journal. . . . Mr. Bowles had an instinctive perception of what was important to a newspaper, and the finest sense of the degrees of importance among various sorts and classes of news, and he possessed an analytical faculty which enabled him at all times to spy out the grains and kernels of important fact in the midst of endless chaff. . . . Any young journalist in search of employment, who could show that he had taken a diploma from the Springfield *Republican*, was sure of a situation in the first vacancy on any high-class journal between the oceans. . . . In all that constitutes taste in journalism,— good taste, condensation, dress, perspicuity, and elevation of tone,— Mr. Bowles was *facile princeps* among his contemporaries."

Murat Halstead gave another view of his journalistic achievement.

"A few volumes make an immense impression of the intensity of the application and the fertility of the resources of an author, and this is associated with many famous names as an element of their glory. Mr. Bowles fashioned more than ten thousand issues of the paper with which his fame is identified, and each not only indicated the courage of his convictions, but was the product of his heart; the effect of every letter and line considered, the whole in matter and manner illustrating his genius. . . . His qualities became known to all who knew the springs of events, from shore to shore of the country, though his bravery rather than his goodness grew familiar to the public. . . . He suffered from his own severities. There was in him a sweet humanity that sorrowed over all the hurts in the battle of life. His hand was hard — the hand of a warrior; but his heart was soft — the heart of a woman. . . . We may, I fear, in grieving that he is gone, think too much of his cares and troubles, and too little of his joys and compensations. He tasked himself, as all the master workmen must do. He was happy in the heavy harness that he wore. His satisfaction with his employment, as he traced the words glowing with his ideas and purposes, that were to be quickly printed and scattered

far and wide, outspeeding the winds and persuading the people, was as keen as the rapture of the poet or orator when kindling with the flame which is divine."

Said Mr. Bird:

"I learned from him — I hope I have learned — absolute independence of partisanship in politics. Though he used to lecture me as a partisan, yet I am quite sure I learned this lesson pretty thoroughly from him — that my duty is first to conscience, and next only to such political relations as will best enable me to fulfill my duty to my conscience."

Said General Hawley:

"No man who had a controversy with him, no old friend estranged for a moment, resisted for a second the grasp of that hand, or the look of that eye, or that bright and happy heart."

Said Mr. Warner:

"In his presence, more than in the presence of almost any other man I have known, all pretense fell away. You all know how immediately, when you began conversation with him, all that was not real dropped away, and you came at once down to the bottom of things. There was not any sham about him at all."

Dr. Holland's tribute to his old colleague as a journalist has already been quoted.* In speaking of his personal traits he said:

"I wish to bear my testimony to his personal purity. I knew his habits and his associations as well as if I had been his crony. He was always outspoken and free in conversation; and while he was catholic in his sympathies, and made a very large place in his toleration for men of all grades of morals, I believe that he never contemplated any sort of association with a doubtful woman with any milder feeling than that of disgust.

*Vol. I., page 65.

To the best of my knowledge and belief, his life was absolutely free from the stains which youthful folly and maturer vice leave upon the record of so many of our great men. The women whom he loved and who loved him were good women, of the highest intellectual grade, and better and purer hearts do not beat than those which build the wall about his personal reputation. . . . I wish also to bear witness to his business integrity. For seventeen years I held the most intimate business relations with him, and during all that period I never saw the one second of time when I questioned his integrity, or suspected that he would take the smallest unfair advantage of me. He was more than just to me; he was generous. It was his generous confidence in me, when I was altogether an untried man, that laid the foundation of my own success in life, of which I here and now make grateful acknowledgment."

Mr. Tiffany said:

"We know by sad experience how the genial flow of friendship and love is conditioned upon freedom from incessant strain of work and care, and that never was deeper philosophy uttered than his in these lines:

> "'A heart at leisure from itself
> To soothe and sympathize.'

"I hold it therefore to be an absolute demonstration of the existence of deep well-springs of love down in the central nature of our friend, that one so overburdened with work and harried with pain should have manifested so remarkable a genius for friendships. . . . It is not often that a man dies over whose grave so many genuine tears are shed. Nothing but great elasticity and power of loving rebound against the wear and tear of life and the disgusts and embitterments of political activity, can account for the open fact of the host of men and women who always rejoiced to meet him, and never left him without a sense that he kept alive a cordial fellow-feeling for them. . . . He was the soul of hospitality. He gave his home not one, but a thousand house-warmings. . . . In respect of that perhaps most infallible of all tests of true quality in a man

—the power of winning the respect and admiration of high-minded women — our friend stood preëminent. And this was based as much on the absolute virginity of his nature as on his brilliant qualities of mind. His admiration was of that chivalrous and knightly kind it is ever an honor for a woman to receive."

Miss Brackett wrote:

"Of all the men I have ever known, he was the only one who never made a woman feel as if he were condescending in thought or word when he talked to her. This always gave me when with him a glad sense of freedom, and left me at liberty thus to be and say my best. . . . Many a man values the friendship of women because they admire him, and, as it were, offer up incense to him. But there was absolutely nothing of this desire for adulation in him. He would have spurned it at once as he would anything morbid or unhealthy."

Mr. Dawes wrote:

"How much those lost who saw or knew only the intellectual, political, or professional Samuel Bowles! Remarkable as all these were, there was still another being, widely separated and living apart from them all. This being fills all my thoughts to-day. The great editor, the political philosopher, the social reformer, the hater of shams and breaker of gods,— unequaled in each capacity,— passes out of sight in this hour of mourning, and I see and think only of the friend and lover, with a charity so large as to cover all uncharitableness, with a fascination of eyes and lips which was sure to steal the bitterness from the sharpest words, with a heart so generous as to blunt the edge of the sharpest reproach. How many times we have confessed and forgiven each other, and arm in arm traveled on, till we stumbled again over some rough rock in our pathway, only to rise and minister to each other's bruises!"

The story which followed of the last interview between the two friends (related in the preceding chapter)

was so characteristic of Mr. Bowles that it came home to the listening audience almost as if they saw and heard him. Another touch of lifelike description was given by Mr. Stearns:

"For years I only knew him as the man with the flaming pen, whose caustic criticisms, biting raillery, and severe analysis I dreaded. But afterward, when I came to know him well, I felt the deep magnetism of the man, and learned the wealth of heart and truth and whiteness of soul within him. He had no patience with anything mean or unclean, but the utmost forbearance with any outbreak of honest difference. I remember, soon after the consummation of the presidential count, several of us were dining together, and of course the topic of topics was discussed. If not the only dissenter from the conclusions arrived at, present, I was the only one filled with the 'dissidence of dissent.' Mr. Bowles made some remarks strongly reproving the filibustering resorted to, when I broke in impetuously, saying, 'If I had been a member of Congress, I would have screamed *No* as long as I had breath to articulate,'—and braced myself for a ferocious defense of my position. Mr. Bowles turned quietly, and with a smile beaming over his face said, 'We all know you would, George; you couldn't have helped doing it!' Of course, the combat of words was impossible. . . . No higher tribute to his goodness, no better eulogy of his worth, can be uttered than has gone out from all this community for the last few weeks, from rich and poor, high and low, from the people, the humble and the weak: 'I am so sorry Sam Bowles is going to die.'"

The occasion needed one other word. In the presence of death, thought reverts instinctively and fondly to the past. There needs recognition too of the present,—of the soul loved and loving, now and here. That word was given in the reading by Mr. Warner of Edwin Arnold's verses, then unfamiliar, "He who died at Azan." That utterance came most fittingly beside the grave of one whose vitality was so intense that death seemed but

a shadow across his passage between two stages of existence.

. . . "I can see your falling tears,
I can hear your sighs and prayers,
Yet I smile, and whisper this:
I am not the thing you kiss;
Cease your tears and let it lie,
It *was* mine, it is not I.

"What ye lift upon the bier
Is not worth a single tear.
'Tis an empty sea-shell — one
Out of which the pearl has gone;
The shell is broken — it lies there;
The pearl, the all, the soul is here.
'Tis an earthen jar, whose lid
Allah sealed, the while it hid
The treasure of his treasury,
A mind that loved him,—let it lie!
Let the shard be earth's once more,
Since the gold is in his store!

. . . "Weep awhile, if ye are fain —
Sunshine still must follow rain;
Only not at death — for death,
Now I know, is that first breath
Which our souls draw when they enter
Life which is of all life center.

. . . "Be ye stout of heart, and come
Bravely onward to your home!"

The estimate in which a public man is held by his contemporaries is in most cases fairly mirrored in the newspaper articles following his death. If some allowance is to be made for an excessive charity toward one just gone, yet upon the whole the judgment of character is generally broader and fairer than a man receives in his life-time. In the case of Mr. Bowles, a special fullness was given the newspaper notices of him by the interest of journalists in a fellow-craftsman, and by the

circumstance that his long illness had given them an opportunity to prepare his obituary in advance. These articles collected would fill a volume about as large as the present one. With hardly an exception they express warm and high appreciation. They recognize with unanimity the excellence of the *Republican* as a newspaper, and the peculiar success of its chief in creating such a paper in a provincial town. They are hardly less unanimous in acknowledging the courage of Mr. Bowles, as well as the effectiveness of his writing, and most of them pay honor to his sincerity and fidelity to conviction. Many note his causticity as excessive, while some attribute it largely to overstrained nerves. The remark is common, that since Greeley's death Bowles has held the first place among journalists. Among the calm and measured judgments are that of the *Nation*, that the *Republican* has been "the most comprehensive newspaper, we believe it is no exaggeration to say, in the country"; and of the Hartford *Courant:* "We are inclined, all things considered, to place him first among the great journalists the country has produced." Henry Watterson, in the *Courier Journal*, quoted the cool and guarded words of the Chicago *Times*, as free from suspicion of friendly bias, and, condensing them, said:

"To say of a man that he edited the model provincial newspaper in the most newspaper-reading country on the globe, that he gave this provincial newspaper national influence and importance, and that he was a statesman rather than a politician, is to say all that could be claimed for a journalist. Yet it is no more than of right belongs to Samuel Bowles."

On the whole, very few men die whose obituaries, could they return to life, would be such pleasant reading for them. He won the prize so rare in his profession that every young man who enters journalism should

renounce the expectation of winning it — personal appreciation from the world.

But it was in his home town that the finest eulogy was pronounced on him. It was spoken by his pastor, and in the church with which he was connected. He had grown up in it from childhood, had listened to the preaching of its successive ministers, and though in later years of necessity an infrequent attendant, he had given to it freely of his money and his sympathy, with at times a felicitous word of suggestion or encouragement.

The minister has not lost all of his old advantage as a public teacher. His habit of judging from the moral stand-point often enables him, when he is not under dogmatic trammels, to look deeper into the nature of men and things than is the wont of the journalist, and to speak out of his week's meditation a weightier word than the man who stands between the telegraph and the printing-press. On the Sunday after Mr. Bowles's death, Rev. A. D. Mayo preached in the Church of the Unity a sermon which was mainly a delineation of his character. From the symmetrical portrait a few salient features are here given:

"I have watched with the deepest interest the bearing of our friend toward the new civilization which is appearing in our New England since the days of the great revolution of 1860. He realized, as very few men who stay at home in New England do, the essential changes, social, religious, political, that have come over the land of the Puritans during the last generation. He was always laboring with the problems of the adjustment of the new to the old; so that the New England of the coming time shall still hold in her heart the mighty faith in righteousness, industry, freedom, and knowledge, which have made her the bulwark of the republic in the days that have gone by. . . . I saw that, after all, he was a Puritan of

the old stock, believing in religion and morality as the soul of society, so intensely that his belief made him angry, impatient, sometimes contemptuous, of such as did not believe; having no confidence that Springfield, or Massachusetts, or the republic, could grow in any save the old-fashioned way of honesty, piety, intelligence, and sleepless jealousy for the freedom to become all of which they are capable. He was a most intelligent friend of the new education in all its bearings, and has been since I have been here one of the firmest supporters of that portion of our city government which is intrusted with the precious treasure, the schools of the people. He understood the real meaning of the word which is in such danger of falling into a destructive cant — economy; that it means for men, church, city, nation, the wise saving from the body, for the generous spending on the soul. I am inclined to think that his service in this home-lot, at the reconstruction of New England, will, in the end, be found the most original and valuable of all his public doings. . . . If New England is to be saved from the all-devouring enemies of modern civilization,— a fanatical despotism and a Godless communism,— and kept abreast of the age, in the line of her great renown, it will be largely by the aid of such patient, intense, and catholic thinkers as Samuel Bowles.

"The sharpest words he wrote at us goaded us to climb over the granite wall of our local narrowness, and look off into the free, broad fields of humanity outside. I have seen few Western men who knew the West as he knew it, and no man west of the Alleghanies or south of Washington who had so fair an estimate of New England as he of every state of the Union.

"He had some of the best characteristics of the best American statesmen; his intellectual range was wide, clear, and rapid, reminding one of the marvelous mental catholicity of Seward more than of any other of our public men. He was essentially a public moralist, and had no faith in governing the world by tricks, by playing off one set of famous people against another, or by anything but doing right on a scale as large as a nation's needs. He had a prodigious faith in

genuine work, and a hatred of sham work anywhere that almost amounted to a monomania.

"If he was often so extreme and unsparing in his attacks upon the prevailing evils of our public life as to give the impression that he had little care for the consequences, he was also singularly conservative and cautious in real administration; in this being again a true son of the Puritans,— a race fearfully radical and untamable in miscellaneous talk, but moderate and conservative beyond all the great peoples in the actual embodiment of ideas and ideals in laws.

"No man better saw than he, that, whatever may be true of Old World empires, which must be governed by parties who represent their different orders of society, this republic must be finally administered by that portion of the people who can rise above parties, sects, social and cultured cliques, and the narrowness of section and race. What he called 'independent journalism' meant essentially the same thing as unsectarian Christianity, unsectional politics, and reformed civil service. A nation really governed by a majority of the whole people must be a nation educated above these Old World traditions of partisan prejudice and hatred.

"No real man, full of American blood and nerves, can nowadays be quite fair, impersonal, and catholic, in the ebb-tide of a revolution that has shaken a continent, in the flood-tide of such popular insanities as threaten us to-day. But it is a very noble thing to insist that this is the way we should all go, and try to go that way with all our might. It is easy enough for a man to be catholic and broad in politics, religion, philosophy, and society, who has no central faith or care for anything; and that heartless and Godless flippancy of judgment is one of the most dangerous diseases of the day. But a thousand times do we honor brave Samuel Bowles, bristling at all points with his most provoking personality, pushing on to the higher mark of our calling in national life, beyond the whole race of mild-mannered, moderate, routine men, who fear, of all things on earth, the opposition of a man alive with a great purpose to the ends of his finger nails, electric even to the very hairs of his head.

"The new journalism after all will rise no higher than the men who wield it. The newspaper is in literature like the violin in music,—the most sensitive and subtle medium of communication between a man and mankind. It can become an all-pervading blessing or an all-pervading curse easier than any other written or spoken word. If any class of men and women should be the sons and daughters of God, and the brothers and sisters of the Lord Jesus Christ, consecrated through all the recesses of the heart, it should be these ministers of the press who watch while men sleep, and meet us at the breakfast table, talking to us even while we ask a blessing on the food.

"The quality that made him what he was — a man apart from the editors and statesmen and scholars and men of affairs who were going the same way — was that marvelous blending of man and woman which marked him as one of the higher order of superior men. Every first-class man is made so by virtue of the womanhood that flavors every manly power and grace; as the granite hill-slope of Berkshire is translated to a garden of the Lord, by the trailing arbutus that blossoms through every ragged ravine, chases the retreating snow bank, and flings out fragrant welcome of spring to the traveler borne swiftly down the winding road to the valley of peacefulness below. He bore into his public life the soul of a high-minded, sensitive, and high-strung woman; flaming out against evils of which good men of another type are too tolerant; like the noblest woman, smitten now and then with admiring hero worship for men who doubtless in another world will justify the prophecy of their good angels who have glorified and loved them in this. He who went after the woman in him often found the sternest, most reticent, and exclusive of able men; while he who charged down upon the savage mailed warrior he took him to be, sometimes found his arm in a clasp as genial and gentle as a sister's, his heart captured by a charm that made him a friend and lover for life.

"His faults were chiefly of the kind we forgive in our wives and mothers, remembering how hard it is for a spirit all through alive and sensitive, impetuous, aspiring, and impatient for the

good time coming, to bear itself with the poise of a calm and passionless Minerva in days like these. Such men as he, so vital, pronounced, and complex in their constitution, can never be well understood, even by their most fervent admirers, until the artist Death gives us their portrait, relieved against the background of the shadow-land, flushed by the rising sun of the life immortal."

Seven years have passed since his death. In a double sense, he built his own monument. In the hearts of his friends his memory will be green so long as they shall last. The newspaper he planted not only lives and flourishes, but has still its best inspiration and governing tradition in the qualities he gave to it.

At the beginning of this story there was given a sketch of the old New England life, just drawing to its close when his life began; but who can undertake to summarize and picture the broad aspects of American society when his life closed? The expansion has been so vast and manifold, the play of new and old forces is so complex and energetic, and we ourselves are so in the midst of the stream, that we cannot see our age in its true proportion and perspective. Even geographical lines have lost their old significance. No such isolated and distinct New England exists as that of sixty years ago, nor any such isolated and distinct America. The old Calvinistic theology, which seemed then just chipping off a little at the edges, has practically lost most of that which distinguished Calvinism from other schools of Protestant Christianity, while the intellectual elements of Christianity itself are held in solution by the common mind of civilization, and the wisest prophet cannot predict what will be the new forms of crystallization. The sixty years have seen a life-and-death struggle between American democracy and slavery, and the purged and renovated nation seems to stand strong, able to slough

off its lesser ills, and hopefully confronting the future. The assertion for women of an equal privilege and an equal responsibility with men has gone far toward realization. The attitude of society toward its criminals and outcasts has profoundly altered. The current of civilization moves with new directness and energy toward a more even diffusion of material advantages. Amid the falling of creeds there slowly emerge the outlines of a nobler faith in God and a higher hope for man. With new opportunities come new dangers,— restlessness, a feverish drain of vitality, an impatience of nature's slow and sure ways, an overhaste which balks itself; and sometimes too a dizzying sense of bewilderment and loss in the breaking up of old beliefs. In science, in literature, in education, in family life, in ideals of character, the changes of half a century have been so swift that only at a later time can they be rightly measured.

This man stood amid the full play of these various forces, sensitive to them all, acting and reacting with them all, chronicling their movement, forwarding that movement, and receiving its impress. He was not one of the great creative minds, but he caught and transmitted the spirit of the time, and with every year he lived he grew more sensitive to the finer elements in the social atmosphere, and more effective in diffusing them. His most distinctive and conspicuous service to the national life was his persistent effort toward superseding party spirit by patriotism. He was as distinctly the apostle of political independence as Garrison of anti-slavery. The whole system of party government is a very imperfect instrument for the ordinary exigencies of society. It rests on the assumption that a fundamental difference of beliefs and purposes divides the community into two opposing classes — an assumption which is true only in exceptional periods of strife; while the organiza-

tions and passions which are born and transmitted during such periods are as unsuited to the normal conditions of the community as the methods and temper of a military society are unfit for an industrial society. While the party system continues — as continue it must until some better method ripens — the only safeguard and corrective to it is the action of men brave enough to stand outside of party lines, intelligent enough to work together for common ends without a rigid organization, and numerous enough to turn the scale, as occasion may require, between the two parties. The significance of the presidential election of 1884, beyond the temporary victory of one party over the other, was the appearance of the Independents for the first time as a decisive factor in a national election. It is not too much to say that no man in the country did more to develop the Independents into a political power than Samuel Bowles. It was due more to him than to any other man among the living or the dead that Massachusetts stood side by side with New York in the moral leadership of the campaign of 1884. The education of an intelligent independence — by constant precept, by constant example, at constant cost, for a quarter of a century — was the greatest single service which he did for his country.

But his relation to politics measures only one side of his work for the community. His distinctive greatness was as a journalist. What he accomplished in that capacity this book has tried to set forth. In the summing-up it is to be considered what he contributed to the ideal of his profession. He represented, first, the extension of its functions into every field of human activity. In his own words: "Our idea of a public journal covers all life — life in its deepest and highest significance, as well as the superficialities of food and raiment, business and

government." In this, too, he was in the line of the unmistakable tendency of the time,— his distinction was to be on the front wave of the tide. But his best service may be measured at the point where lies the greatest danger to the character of the press. The new sovereign is under the temptation of every popular ruler — to achieve power by appealing to the lower grades of constituencies. The moral danger of the newspaper is lest it become a mere instrument of money-making. The American press shows to-day a mixture of the most opposite tendencies. In many quarters there is a marked advance in fairness, dignity, decency, and in other quarters there is just as notable a decay of these virtues. The most lamentable spectacle in journalism is presented by those newspapers which win commercial success either by prostitution to gross partisanship or by catering to the coarsest tastes.

If the powers of Samuel Bowles had been devoted solely to money-making, he might well have been a millionaire long before he died; he might have lengthened and enjoyed in luxurious ease the years which he cut short by toil. But he bent his best energies to making a paper which should speak the truth and should educate its constituency. He gave his readers better food than they asked for. He gave them what men are wont to expect from the library and the pulpit, and dressed the solidest dish with an appetizing sauce. He made his paper the vehicle of literature, of philosophy, of poetry, of religion. Yet he was not an idealist pure and simple. He had a Yankee eye to the main chance. He made the earning of money one object, though not the supreme object. The example he furnished was less heroic than that of the man who for the truth gives up life or livelihood, but it was an example more widely

applicable. He showed that a man can be truthful without starving, and that a newspaper can be independent without ending in bankruptcy.

His genius was the power to see and his virtue was the courage to speak. His best service as a journalist was to exemplify the quality most necessary for a public teacher — absolute truthfulness. With him the sum and substance of independent journalism — and he recognized no other journalism as of the highest class — was to tell the truth without fear or favor. It is in this respect that his ideal will be longest in finding a general fulfillment. Truth-speaking, as an obligation paramount to partisanship, friendship, and all personal ends, is not an ingenious invention, which when once discovered is speedily adopted by every one. It implies a quality in character, such as in a high degree is not often found, and toward which mankind rises with extreme slowness. For almost two thousand years religion has laid its chief ethical stress upon belief and benevolence. Truthfulness, in its double sense of seeking the truth and speaking it, has hardly yet got beyond its Bethlehem.

He worked in a field little favorable to independence. He conquered his environment largely by virtue of a dominant and masterful quality which ran in his blood. Nature framed him for a rebel against despotism. He had that mixture of reverence for law and impatience of arbitrary power which marks the line of great leaders who have broadened English and American freedom. His love of mastery worked hand in hand with his love of truth and his instinct as a journalist, to keep his paper independent of party, of church, of all authority save his own convictions. He did not escape the "limitations of his own qualities." Emerson says that when Nature would accomplish an important object, she loads some man with an overcharge of the necessary quality.

In molding Samuel Bowles, she tempered the material with a slight excess of the rebel's virtue — audacity and self-assertion. That overcharge won for society a vital gain at a vital point. It exemplified the quality most essential to the foremost profession of the time. Against a pressure subtle and weighty as the atmosphere, it established a newspaper subject to no law save its own belief.

The full test of a man's worth is to measure the contribution he makes to society, and then ask what he was outside of that work. This man, reaching in his special task the height of manly achievement, lived a personal life of singular richness in the tenderness and generosity of its affections. "The friendliest of men" would be the verdict of those who knew him best. He was more than a journalist, a statesman, a genius,— he was a lover. The air about him was warm with kindness. He was most faithful to every old attachment, most receptive of every new one. His regard expressed itself in service. His thought toward his friends was, "What can I do for them?" Not only men and women, but the broad and the near community, the neighborhood, every familiar scene, every old association, every fresh aspect of nature's face, found a place in his heart. It was the frequent necessity of his position to fight; it was the constant and growing necessity of his nature to love and to be loved.

He was the child of his age, and shared its strength and its weakness. In his unresting activity he was its very epitome. He illustrated the master passion of its intellect — the desire to learn something new. One of its chief characteristics is the growth of mutual communication between men. The agencies of that communication are invention, commerce, travel, and journalism. Its ultimate result is the overthrow of prejudice, the increase of mutual respect and trust, the recognition of

a common interest, the spread at last of peace and brotherhood. That spirit of mutual inter-communication ran in his every vein. He learned something from each man he met, and in turn taught something to each man he met. His instinct and habit were to seek and find fellowship with every one. In this he was a type of the age — its wars are its passing accidents, and its essential movement is toward peace.

He shared to the full the characteristic misfortune of the time — an overactivity which reacts in weakness and suffering. To this was due the strand of torture which was interwoven with the later half of his life. He felt too the want of assured religious faith which is in the air of this transition time. The poor Catholic who lay dying near him had something which he lacked. But for him, as for many men of our age, the want of spiritual faith was not chiefly due to intellectual perplexities,— it was due rather to the walls which his unresting action built up, shutting off the soul from free communion with the eternal. "Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our heart is unquiet until it rests in Thee." That rest cannot be fully felt except as the soul learns passivity and self-surrender.

It has been the aim of these pages to give the reader so much as might be of the man himself. Such a story reveals something of that sublime process, the education of a soul. We see his original inheritance, the gift of Puritanism,— the inwrought virtues of industry, sobriety, self-control; the loyalty to family, to the community, and to conscience. The great teacher, Work, takes the boy in hand, and urges him on. Affection sweetens and exalts him. He learns the sacred lessons which wedlock and fatherhood impart. The tremendous drama of the age claims him as one of its actors. Humanity opens wide its book before his eyes. Nature

ministers to him her sacramental revelations. Friendship pours her treasures into his hands. Then comes the stern ministry of Pain, and he grows gentler and stronger under it. Wider vision comes to him, and new tenderness, even while the iron enters into his soul. And all the while the lower and the higher self in the man are waging their war,— the flesh against the spirit, the love of power against the regard for others. He has reached mid-life, and, watching him, we long that the strain of work may be lightened, that so there might come to him the happiness of health and the mellow ripening of leisure. Nay, he cannot be spared from toil and combat,— the world needs him,— and his best work is given in these years when the cost to him is sorest. New fields are won, but there are battles that leave ache and scar. An autumnal soberness comes over his sky, but there mingles with it the tenderness of the Indian summer. Now at last he has done his work for earth, and earth has done its work for him,— the tired hands cling yet to their completed task, but the sovereign Voice calls, and he passes beyond our sight.

THE END.

INDEX.*

Abbott, Josiah G., of Massachusetts; candidate for U. S. Senator (1874), **2**: 273; on Presidential Electoral Commission (1876), 296.

Adams, Charles Francis, Quincy, Mass.; Free-soil candidate for Vice-president (1848), **1**: 52, 54, 55; **2**: 180
a leader of the "Conscience Whigs" in Mass., **1**: 52; **2**: 18
on committee to organize Republican party in Mass. (1855), **2**: 140, 141
advocated conciliation of the South, after Lincoln's election (1860), **1**: 277, 279, 319; [**2**: 180
Minister to England, **1**: 358; **2**: 180
vainly urged British government to forbid Confederate cruisers to sail from English ports, **2**: 119
nominated for U. S. Senator by People's Convention (1862); indorsed by the Democrats; his name withdrawn by J. Q. Adams, **1**: 358
resigned English mission; succeeded by Reverdy Johnson (1868), **2**: 120
member of the International Board of Arbitration, Geneva (1872), **2**: 181
candidate for nomination in Cincinnati National Convention (1872), **2**: 184–187
defeated by Horace Greeley, **2**: 187, 210
—— for U. S. Senator, to succeed Sumner (1873), **2**: 266
—— U. S. Senator, to succeed Dawes (1874), **2**: 273
candidate for Republican nomination for Governor; defeated by A. H. Rice (1874), **2**: 273
nominated for Governor by the Democrats (1876), **2**: 275, 277, 281, 353
proposed for Republican nomination for President *in* 1876, **2**: 348, 349
supported by Bowles and the *Republican*, **1**: 319; **2**: 180, 181, 189, 210, 211, 215, [266, 273, 275, 322, 348, 349, 353, 355
his support by Bowles an established joke, **2**: 322
his personal characteristics, **2**: 180, 181
his estimate of Carl Schurz's political discernment, **2**: 131
not desirous of office, **2**: 181, 184
wrote letter read at Bowles's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), **2**: 442.

Adams, Charles Francis, Jr., Quincy, Mass.; supported Gen. Grant for President, **2**: 195, 216; protested against carpet-baggism, 195; proposed for Governor (1872), 215, 216; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; meetings with Bowles, 150; supported by Bowles and the *Republican*, 215; spoke at Bowles's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441.

Adams, Charles H., associate editor of the *Republican*, **2**: 307.

Adams, John Quincy, Quincy, Mass.; Democratic candidate for Governor (1871), defeated by Washburn, **2**: 109; urged upon the Democrats a "New Departure" (1871), 135.

Addison, Joseph, used journalism as a moralist, **1**, 201.

Administrations: *See the names of the Presidents severally, viz.:*

Adams, John,	Johnson, A.,
Adams, John Q.,	Lincoln, A.,
Buchanan, J.,	Madison, J.,
Fillmore, M.,	Monroe, J.,
Grant, U. S.,	Pierce, F.,
Harrison, W. H.,	Polk, J. K.,
Hayes, R. B.,	Taylor, Z.,
Jackson, A.,	Tyler, J.,
Jefferson, T.,	Van Buren, M.,
	Washington, G.

Aiken, David, Greenfield, Mass.; Judge of Common Pleas, Mass. (1859), **1**, 296.

* For the preparation of this Index the author is indebted to Mr. Dorsey Gardner.

Alabama [*See also* South], joined the Southern Confederacy (1861), **1**: 274
voted for Grant for President (1868), **2**: 43.

"Alabama" claims, adjusted by Treaty of Washington between Great Britain and the United States (1871), **2**: 119–123, 230.

Albany, N. Y., visit of BOWLES to, meeting with Thurlow Weed (1860), **1**: 302.

Albany *Argus*, favored Electoral Commission to determine the disputed Hayes-Tilden Presidential election (1876), **2**: 293.

Albany *Evening Journal* (Thurlow Weed, editor), urged compromises to avoid Secession (1861), **1**: 276.

Alexander, Henry, Jr., of Springfield, Mass.; his character in business and in politics, **2**: 315, 343; married Amelia, 2d sister of SAMUEL BOWLES, 315; a Republican "machine" politician, 268, 269, 314; nominated for Congress; opposed by the *Republican*; defeated (1874), 269, 272, 314, 315, 342, 343; privately urged by BOWLES not to run, 269, 315, 342; family estrangement, 315; visited BOWLES in his last illness (1877), 435.

Alexander, Mrs. Henry, *née* Amelia Bowles (q. v.), 2d sister of SAMUEL BOWLES; visit at her home, in Brooklyn, from SAMUEL BOWLES (1852), **1**: 59; her Springfield house the home of her mother, and the family gathering-place; **2**: 314; visited BOWLES in his last illness, (Dec. 2, 1877), 435.

Alleghany Mountains, BOWLES's impressions of (1866), **2**: 53.

Alps, BOWLES's impressions of (1862), **1**: 372–375, 383, 385.

Allen, Charles, of Worcester, Mass.; delegate to Whig National Convention (1848), **1**, 52; bolted nomination of Taylor for President (1848), 52; supported National Free-soil Convention, Buffalo (1848), 52.

Allen, Charles, of Greenfield, Mass.; letters from BOWLES *in* 1851, **1**: 162; *in* 1852, 163; *in* 1854, 164; *in* 1855, 164, 168, 170; *in* 1856, 173–177; *in* 1857, 289–295; *in* 1858, 295; *in* 1859, 296–302, **2**: 384; *in* 1860, **1**: 302, 303, 308; *in* 1861, 316, 320, 328, 330; *in* 1862, 334 (from Europe), 368; *in* 1864, 411, 415; *in* 1865, **2**: 46; *in* 1866, 46, 47; *in* 1870, 158, 160; *in* 1872, 210, 214, 216; *in* 1874, 339; *in* 1875, 348; *in* 1876, 327; traveled with BOWLES in the West, (1857), **1**: 187; traveled with BOWLES to White Mountains (1861), 310, 321–328; BOWLES's 2d son named after him (1861) 311, 332; defended BOWLES in libel suit of Willis Phelps (1875), **2**: 316, 346; supported Grant against Greeley for President (1872), 206; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), 274; with BOWLES in his last illness (1877), 435.

Allen, Wm., Democrat, Governor of Ohio (1873), **2**: 244; renominated for Governor (1875); defeated by R. B. Hayes, 244, 245; favored inconvertible paper currency, 244.

Ames, Adelbert, of Massachusetts, "carpet-bag" Governor of Mississippi, **2**: 248; alleged terrorism by the Democrats; called on President Grant for troops; was refused, 248, 249.

Ames, Mary Clemmer, writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389.

Ames, Oakes, M.C. from Massachusetts; early projector of Union Pacific R.R., 226; authorized by directors to distribute Credit Mobilier stock, "where it will produce most good to us" (1868), **2**: 226, 228; charged with bribing members of Congress in the Pacific R. R. legislation (1872), **2**: 196, 217, 219, 225; Congressional investigation, 225–228; denied bribery but was found guilty, and his expulsion recommended, 196, 227; censured by vote of the House, 227; died, 227, 228.

Amherst, Mass.; visits of BOWLES to, **1**: 310; **2**: 79, 80, 150; BOWLES a trustee of Amherst College (1866–1878), **2**: 79, 80.

Anderson, Robert, Major, U. S. A., commanded forts in Charleston harbor (1860), **1**: 277; concentrated his troops in Fort Sumter (Dec. 26, 1860), 278, 284, 286, 287; a squadron sent to his relief (Jan. 9, 1861), 278, 287; summoned to surrender, 288; attacked by Rebel batteries (April 12, 13), 288; evacuated the fort, 288.

Andrew, John A., of Massachusetts; delegate to Massachusetts Republican Convention (1854), **1**: 123; the greatest among the Republican leaders in Massachusetts, 132, 267, 361; not at first appreciated by BOWLES, 196, 266, 283, 318, 319; as president of the Massachusetts Republican Convention, denounced Slavery (1858), 244, 266; sympathy for John Brown, 267; nominated for Governor; elected (1860), 196, 266, 268; opposed concession to the South in his inaugural address, 276; censured by the *Republican*, 283, 318; reëlected Governor (1861, 1862, 1863, 1864), 356, 359, 361; his support recommended by BOWLES (1863), 390; favored magnanimous treatment of the South after the war, **2**: 45, 125.

Anthony, Susan B., her work in the "woman's movement," **2**: 391.

Antietam, Md., battle of, **1**: 343.

Arkansas, joined the Southern Confederacy after the fall of Fort Sumter (1861), **1**: 288
voted for Grant for President (1868), **2**: 43

Arkansas *(continued)*, effort of the Grant Administration Republicans to control the [vote of the State (1875), **2**: 237
Pres. Grant urged Congress, in a message, to set aside the (Democratic) State gov- [ernment; Congress refused (1875), 237–240.

Arnold, Edwin, his poem, *He who died at Azan,* read at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), **2**: 447, 448.

Ashmun, George (1804–1870), of Springfield, Mass., **1**: 35, 53, 54, 96, 417; writer for the *Republican,* 35, 43, 415; death (1870), 38; influence with President Lincoln, 40, 42; influence with Stephen A. Douglas, 40; influence in Congress, 41; intimacy with Daniel Webster, 41, 76; originally a Whig, 41; became a Republican, 42; presided at Republican National Convention, Chicago (1860), 42, 262; presided at Whig Convention in Massachusetts (1847), 48; delegate to Whig National Convention, (1852), 93, 94; chairman of Committee on Resolutions, 94; meetings with BOWLES, Washington (1852), 101.

Atchison, David R., U. S. Senator from Missouri; promoted pro-Slavery outrages in Kansas (1854), **1**: 129.

Atkinson, Edward, of Mass.; attacked B. F. Butler, **2**: 92, 93; supported Liberal Republican movement (1872), 179; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), 274.

Atlantic Monthly, of Boston; BOWLES wrote articles on "The Pacific Railroad Open," for (1868), **2**: 81.

Ayer, Dr. James C., of Massachusetts; Republican candidate for Congress (1873); defeated, **2**: 270, 272.

Babcock, Gen., military attaché of Gen. Grant, **2**: 128, 251; negotiated for annexation of San Domingo to the United States (1870), 128; implicated in the Whisky Ring (1875), 251.

Bacon, Rev. Dr. Leonard, of New Haven; preached duty of emancipation in Fast Day sermon (1861), **1**: 351.

Baez, President of San Domingo; negotiated for annexation to the United States (1870), **2**: 128.

Bailey, Dr., editor of the *National Era;* advocated Fremont for President (1856), **1**: 72.

Baltimore, Md., first telegraphic dispatch between it and Washington (1844), **1**: 26; National Constitutional Union Convention, May, 1860; Bell nominated, 264; National Democratic Convention, Northern wing, June, 1860; secession of Gen. Butler and others; S. A. Douglas nominated, 261; National Democratic Convention, Southern wing; J. C. Breckenridge nominated, 261; National Republican Convention, renominating Lincoln (1864), 360; National Republican Convention demanded "the utter and complete extirpation of Slavery," 362; National Democratic Convention, indorsing Cincinnati Liberal Republican Convention's nomination of Greeley for President (1872), **2**: 190.

Bank of California: *see* San Francisco.

Banks, Nathaniel P., of Massachusetts; left Democratic for Free-soil party (1848), **1**: 54; in Congress, opposed extension of Slavery (1854), 116; Speaker of the House (1855), 130, 196, 243; presided at Massachusetts Republican Convention (1855), 142; declined "Northern American" nomination for President (1856), 152; Republican Governor of Massachusetts (1858, 1859, 1860), 134, 196, 243, 244, 295, 296, 297; removed Judge Loring, 134; declined renomination as Governor (1860), 266; urged policy of conciliating the South in his last Governor's message (1860), 276; named as Republican candidate for President (1860), 263, 301, 303; named for office in Lincoln's Cabinet, 318; elected to Congress, Independent (1874), **2**: 272; self-seeking in politics, **1**: 132; early promise not fulfilled, 132, 393; supported by BOWLES and the *Republican,* 244, 263, 301, 303; dissatisfied BOWLES by his appointments to office, as Governor of Massachusetts (1858), 295, 296, 297, 300; meetings with BOWLES, Washington (1865), 416.

Barker, Dr. Fordyce, of New York; treated Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES, **1**: 311, 331, 400, 409; visit from Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES, **2**: 48, 151; meetings with BOWLES, 170.

Barnard, George G., Judge of Supreme Court, New York; his injunctions in the Erie Ring cases, **2**: 101.

"Barn-burners," political slang name in New York, **1**: 52; seceded from the Democratic party and supported Van Buren (1848), 52, **2**: 176.

Bartholo, Dr., of Cincinnati; prescribed diet treatment for BOWLES (1876), **2**: 351, (1877) 417.

Bartlett, D. W. ("Van"), Washington correspondent of the *Republican,* **1**: 388; **2**: 431; letter from BOWLES (1877), **2**: 431.

Bartlett, Homer, of Massachusetts; supported H. J. Gardner for Governor *in* 1856, **1**: 174.

Bartlett, Gen. Wm. F., of Pittsfield, Mass.; supported Liberal Republican movement (1872), **2**: 179; nominated for Lieut.-Governor by the Democrats; declined (1875), 274, 347, 348; letters from BOWLES (1875), **2**: 347, 348; *in* 1876, 353; died, Dec. 18, 1876; his obituary by BOWLES, 353, 385.

Bates, Edward, of Missouri; urged for Republican candidate for President (1860), **1**: 263; in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), 282.
Bayard, Thomas F.; Democrat, U. S. Senator from Delaware; favored arbitration of the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), **2**: 122; favored Democratic independence in Baltimore National Convention which nominated Greeley (1872), 190; opposed Sherman's bill for resuming specie payments (1874), 241, 242; on joint committee of conference on disputed Presidential election (1876), 288; advocated creation of an electoral commission, 294; made a member of the commission, 296.
Beach, E. D., of Springfield; Democratic candidate for Governor of Massachusetts (1854); defeated, **1**: 125, 141, 144; Democratic and anti-Prohibitionist candidate (1855); defeated, 144; Democratic candidate (1860); defeated, 268.
Beecher, Rev. Henry Ward, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; his sermons, **2**: 48; in social life, 49; the Tilton case (1875), 346.
Belknap, General Wm. W., personal friend of General Grant, **2**: 113, 252; Secretary of War in Grant's Cabinet (1868), 113; assured Kellogg, Radical Governor of Louisiana, of support by the Administration (1874), 235; detected in taking bribes; resigned; impeached (1875), 252, 255.
Bell, John, of Tennessee; political influence in Tennessee, **1**: 228; "Constitutional Union" candidate for President (1860); defeated, 264, 268.
Bell, Dr. Luther V., Somerville, Mass.; nominated by Whigs for Governor of Massachusetts (1856), **1**: 155, 74.
Bellows, Rev. Dr. Henry W., of New York; preached duty of Emancipation in Fast Day sermon (1861), **1**: 351.
Benjamin, Judah P., U. S. Senator from Louisiana; advocated extension of Slavery (1854), **1**: 116.
Bennett, James Gordon, founded the N. Y. *Herald* (1835), **1**: 28; new methods of news-giving, 28, 29; **2**: 442; preserved independence from parties, 67; inaugurated reporting religious intelligence (1839), **2**: 366.
Benton, Col. James G., of Springfield; member of "The Club," **2**: 76.
Benton, Thomas H., M. C. from Missouri; opposed extension of Slavery (1854), **1**: 116.
Berea, Ky., purged of anti-Slavery men by a mob (1859), **1**: 258.
Berlin, Germany, considered by BOWLES the representative city of Germany, **2**: 155; his poor opinion of its shops, clothing, etc., 162, 172.
Bernard, Montague, British commissioner on the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), **2**: 121.
Bigelow, John, of New York, **2**: 151.
Bill, Mrs. Gurdon, of Springfield; cooperated with BOWLES in organizing Union Relief Association (1877), **2**: 326.
Bingham, John A., M. C. from Ohio; manager in impeachment of Pres. Johnson (1868), **2**: 35.
Bird, Frank W., of Massachusetts; a leader in the Free-soil party in 1850, **1**: 91; reproached for supporting B. F. Butler (1868), **2**: 93; opposed the Hartford and Erie R. R. job (1869), 105, 158; supported Liberal Republican movement (1872), 179, 184; nominated for Governor by the Democrats (1872), 199, 215; spoke at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441, 444.
Bird, Miss Isabella, of Edinburgh, Scotland; traveled in America, **1**: 370; wrote for the *Republican*, 370; meetings with BOWLES, 370; **2**: 174.
Birney, James G., "Liberty Party" candidate for President (1844), **1**: 46,52.
"Black Friday" (Sept. 23, 1869), "corner" in stocks, produced by Fisk and Gould, **2**: 104.
Black Hawk War, **1**: 235.
Black, Jeremiah S., of Pennsylvania; in Buchanan's Cabinet (1857), **1**: 222; counsel for the Democrats before Presidential Electoral Commission (1876), **2**: 297.
Blaine, James G., M. C. from Maine; chosen Speaker, over Dawes, to succeed Colfax (1870), **2**: 118, 143, 232, 255, 333; appointed committees favoring inflation, high tariff, and the railroad corporations (1873), 333; opposed the Grant Administration's Force Bill (1875), 238; avoided implication with the Grant cabal, 250; proposed amending the Amnesty Bill by excluding Jeff. Davis (1875), 250; conflicts with ex-Confederate congressmen, 250; aspired to the Presidency, 250, 253; not acceptable to the Reform party, 349; charged with bribery and stock-jobbing in railroad operations (1876), 255, 372; denied charges; investigated by a House committee; investigation interrupted by his illness, June 11; went to Maine; resigned membership of the House (terminating the investigation) to become Senator, 255–259, 261, 262; candidate for Presidential nomination, Republican National Convention, Cincinnati; opposed by Bristow and others; defeated by R. B. Hayes, June, 259, 260; appointed U. S. Senator, to fill Morrill's unexpired term, 262; took the stump for Hayes during the campaign, 281; opposed the bill creating the Electoral Commission, 294; evaded vote on legality of the Louisiana Returning Board, 298; ignored by the Hayes Administration, 304; opposed President Hayes's policy of reconciliation and reform, 306; meetings with BOWLES, 170, 406; opposed by BOWLES, 333, 349, 407; favored by BOWLES, 372.

Blair, Francis P., Sr., editor of Washington *Globe*, **1**: 26.

Blair, Francis P., Jr., of Missouri; Democratic candidate for Vice-president (1868); defeated, **2**: 41–43; worked for Gratz Brown's nomination for President by Liberal Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1872), 186; promoted Greeley's nomination, 212.

Blair, Montgomery, Postmaster-General in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), **1**: 282.

Blandford, Mass.; summer residence of the BOWLES family, **2**: 142; *in* 1867, 55, 352. 412.

Bliss, George, of Springfield, Mass.; on committee to organize Republican party in Mass. (1855), **1**: 140; supported Gardner for Governor (1856), 174.

Bliss, George, Jr., of New York; negligent friendship for BOWLES, **2**: 219.

Booth, Newton, U. S. Senator from California; letters from BOWLES (1876), **2**: 354, 356; his campaign speeches, 354.

Borie, A. E., of Philadelphia, Penn.; named by Grant as Secretary of the Navy (1868), **2**: 113.

Boston, Mass.; home of Joshua Bowles, **1**: 2; "Master Tileston's School," 2; "Old South Church," 2; social characteristics, 183; alive to intellectual movements, 34, 183; popular hatred of Slavery, 86, 89; provincialism, **2**: 211, 409; journalism in, **1**: 181, 183, 184, 291, 355; inveterate discordance of its editors, 355, 356; general support of B. F. Butler (1858), **2**: 93; general support of the Hartford & Erie R. R. job (1869), 104; fugitive slave, Shadrach, arrested for rendition, but liberated by a mob (1851), **1**: 86. 89; fugitive slave, Thomas Simons, remanded by U. S. Commission (1851), 86, 119; fugitive slave, Anthony Burns, remanded (1854), 119–121; popular resistance, 119; meeting for organization of the Republican party in Massachusetts (1855), 140; indignation meeting in Faneuil Hall to protest against usurpation of power in the South by the Grant Administration (1875), **2**: 235; Simmons, *protégé* of B. F. Butler, appointed Collector of Boston by Pres. Grant (1873), 266; BOWLES's attempt to develop an independent journal in [*see* Boston *Traveller*, below], **1**: 181–188, 290; his dislike for the place, 205; dislike for the people, 324; **2**: 211; visits to (1864), **1**: 414; (1869), **2**: 144; (1871), 166.

Boston *Advertiser*, its commercial standing, **1**: 284, 292; not antagonized by BOWLES's editorship of the *Traveller* (1857), 292; demanded civil-service reform (1873), **2**: 231; opposed the Grant Administration's Force Bill (1875), 238; opposed Sherman's Resumption of Specie Payment Bill (1875), 241; an extreme Republican partisan, 288; challenged the count of Louisiana's vote for Hayes for President (1876), 288; favored Electoral Commission to determine the Hayes-Tilden disputed Presidential election, 293.

Boston *Atlantic Monthly*, **1**: 419; BOWLES contributed papers on the Pacific Railroad (1868), **2**: 81.

Boston *Atlas*, its system of election returns adopted by the *Republican*, **1**: 24; BOWLES reported for it the Know-nothing National Council, Philadelphia (1855), 137; supported H. J. Gardner, Know-nothing, for Governor (1856), 173, 174; consolidated, under BOWLES's editorship, with the Boston *Traveller* (*q. v.*) (1857), 181–184.

Boston *Commonwealth*, **1**: 390, 415; BOWLES's counsel to F. B. Sanborn (*q. v.*), its editor (1863), 390.

Boston *Courier*, a rival of the *Advertiser*, **1**: 292.

Boston *Globe*, reminiscences of BOWLES, published after his death, **2**: 413–415.

Boston *Herald*, only Boston opponent of Hartford and Erie R. R. job (1869), **2**: 104; favored Electoral Commission to determine the disputed Hayes-Tilden Presidential election (1876), 293; BOWLES's friendly terms with its managers, 337, 424, 432.

Boston *Journal*, **1**: 185; rivalry of the *Traveller* with (1857), 293; nature of its popularity, **2**: 97; opposed railroad jobs (1870), 158; favored Electoral Commission to determine the Hayes-Tilden Presidential election (1876), 293.

Boston *Liberator*, Abolition organ, favored disunion (1859), **1**: 258; favored Lincoln's reëlection as President (1864), 413.

Boston *Post*, its commercial standing, **1**: 184; ready to waive party lines and support the government in the war, 355; favored Electoral Commission to determine the disputed Hayes-Tilden Presidential election (1876), **2**: 293.

Boston *Telegraph and Chronicle*, consolidated, under BOWLES's editorship, with the Boston *Traveller* (*q. v.*) (1857), **1**: 181, 184.

Boston *Transcript*, **1**: 185; favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), **2**: 253.

Boston *Traveller*, enlarged by the consolidation with the *Atlas* and *Telegraph and Chronicle*, and edited as a Republican organ by BOWLES (April, 1857), **1**: 181–188, 202, 292–295; BOWLES withdrew from its editorship (Sept. 10, 1857), 183, 186, 294, 306; acquired by Gov. Gardner and Know-nothing associates, 185–187; only Boston paper to support Gen. Butler for Governor (1876), **2**: 275.

Botts, John Minor, of Virginia; Unionist leader in Presidential election 1856), **1**: 154.

Boutwell, George; elected Governor of Massachusetts by the Democrats (1850), **1**: 92; defeated for Governor (1851), 94; on a committee to organize a new political party (1855), 140; manager in impeachment of Pres. Johnson (1868), **2**: 35; reproached for supporting B. F. Butler (1868), 93; Secretary of the Treasury in Grant's Cabinet (1868), 113; sought the U. S. senatorship (1872), 220; elected U. S. Senator, over Dawes, to succeed Wilson (1873), 264, 331; ultra partisanship, 277; favored moderation in Louisiana political conflict (1875), 236; presided at Massachusetts Republican Convention (1876), 275; defeated for reëlection to U. S. senatorship by G. F. Hoar (1876), 277, 356.

Bowles Ancestry, **1**: 1–4; name spelled "Bolles" in England, 1; family records by [Samuel Bowles (II.), 1

1. **John** (I.) (16—), founder of the family in America, **1**: 1
2. **John** (II.) 1653–1691), **1**: 1
3. **John** (III.) (1685–1737), **1**: 2
4. **Joshua** (1722–1794), **1**: 2
5. **Samuel** (I.) (1762–1813), **1**: 2
6. **Samuel** (II.) (1797–1851), **1**: 2–4; in his father's shop, then a printer's apprentice, 3
member of the debating club, **1**: 3
worked as printer, journeyman, and foreman in Hartford and New Haven (1812–18), feeble health, **1**: 3, 4 [**1**: 3
married Huldah Deming, of Wethersfield, Conn., **1**: 4
moved to Springfield, Mass. (1824), and established the *Republican*, weekly newspaper, Sept. 8, 1824, **1**: 4 [
his children [*indexed severally*], **1**: 4
   1. Albert (1823–24),
   2. Julia (1824–51),
   3. Samuel (III.) (1826–78),
   4. Amelia,
   5. Benjamin Franklin.

member of the Unitarian Church, deacon, etc., **1**: 11, 12
his household, **1**: 13–19, 57, 204
religious observances, **1**: 13, 22
his daily life, **1**: 15
apprentices and others lived in the family, **1**: 15, 33, 57, 58
disapproved a college education for his sons, **1**: 16, 17, 20
persuaded by his son to publish the *Republican* daily (1844), **1**: 21
involved in a quarrel about management of the U. S. armory at Springfield, and the *Gazette* started as a rival to the *Republican* (1846); absorbed by it (1848), **1**: 23, [24
his crude ideas of journalism, **1**: 30, 31
business management, **1**: 32, 58, 59
sold to Samuel III. one-half interest in the *Republican*, **1**: 57
died, (1851), **1**: 59

Bowles, Albert (1823-24) oldest brother of Samuel III., **1**: 4.

Bowles, Amelia, sister of Samuel III., **1**: 4; his practical helper in the household, 17; married to Henry Alexander [*further entries under* Alexander], 59.

Bowles, Benjamin Franklin, younger brother of Samuel III., **1**: 4; called indifferently "Ben" and "Frank," 369; traveled in Europe in youth, **2**: 319; traveled with his brother in Europe (1862), **1**: 315, 340, 369, 373, 375; his character and tastes, **2**: 319, 320; became a partner in the *Republican*, **1**: 387: **2**: 201, 319; remained with his brother after dissolution with other partners (1872), 204; lived with his mother until his marriage, 314; built a house on the site of his father's home, 320; disagreed with his brother as to business management (1875), 320, 321; traveled with his wife in Europe and Egypt (1875-6), 321; wrote letters for the *Republican*, 321; sickened in Rome and died in Paris (1876), 321; his memorial service in Springfield, 321.

Bowles, Bessie, 10th child of Samuel Bowles, **2**: 140; childhood, 167, 171.

Bowles, Charles Allen, 7th child and 2d surviving son of Samuel Bowles; born, New York (1861), **1**: 311, 331, 333; childhood, 396, 404, 405, 407; **2**: 171.

Bowles, Dwight, 8th child and 3d surviving son of Samuel Bowles; born, New York (1863), **1**: 400; childhood, 406, 412; **2**: 171.

Bowles, Edwin, cousin of Samuel Bowles; recommended by him for postmastership at Huntington, Mass. (1861), **1**: 321.

Bowles, Huldah (Deming), mother of Samuel (III.), **1**: 4; married and moved to Springfield, 4; her children, 4; character, manners, appearance, 15; energy and business judgment, 15, 16; made home comfortable, 22; lost her husband (1851), 59; went to Brooklyn to nurse her son (1852), 59; visits from and to her children and grandchildren, 402, 405; lived with her 2d son (Ben, *alias* Frank) till his marriage, **2**: 314; lived with her daughter (Mrs. Henry Alexander), 314; died of paralytic stroke (1871), 314, 327.

Bowles, Julia (1824–51), oldest sister of SAMUEL BOWLES (III.), **1**: 4; taken in infancy to Springfield (1824), 4; married Mr. Foote; lost a child, and died (1851), 59.
Bowles, Mary, 3d child and 2d daughter of SAMUEL BOWLES; born (1854), **1**: 58; oversaw outdoor administration of the family home, **2**: 140, 157; at home, in the absence of her mother and older sister (1871), 168, 171; married William H. King, of Springfield (April, 1875), 329, 330. [*Further entries under* KING.]

Bowles, Mary S. D., wife of SAMUEL BOWLES (III.) (Sept. 6, 1848), **1**: 56 [*previous entries under* SCHERMERHORN, MARY S. D.]
happy married life, **1**: 56, 204, 205, 216
care for her husband's comfort and health, **1**: 56, 58, 204, 205, 297; **2**: 73, 139
lived with her mother-in-law (1848–52), **1**: 57, 59
visits to the *Republican* office, **1**: 57
her children [*indexed severally, as* Bowles, Bessie; Charles Allen; Dwight; Mary; Ruth; Samuel (IV.); *and* Sarah Augusta], **1**: 58, 311; **2**: 139, 140
lived in their own house, Maple St., Springfield (1852–64), **1**: 59, 390
her household management, **1**: 60, 163, 327, 412; **2**: 140, 150
home life, **1**: 74, 140–143, 329
promoted intimate confidence between her daughters and their father, **1**: 329
her house a popular visiting-place, **1**: 211, 212, 327; **2**: 142, 150, 152, 154
administered the charities for the family, **1**: 326, 327, 340, 395
over-economical in self-denial, **1**: 402; **2**: 142
drives, excursions, etc., with her husband, **1**: 142
summer home at Blandford, Mass., **1**: 142, 215, 351, 352, 412
lost an infant child (Nov., 1855), **1**: 170, 171
lost two other children, **1**: 311
remained in Springfield while BOWLES edited the *Traveller* in Boston (1857), **1**: 182, [189, 205, 292
excursion, with BOWLES, to Albany (1860), **1**: 302
lived, with BOWLES, at Brevoort House, New York, for medical treatment by Dr. Barker (1861), **1**: 311, 330, 331
birth of her 7th child, Charles Allen, New York (1861), **1**: 311, 331
remained in Springfield while BOWLES traveled in Europe (1862), **1**: 315, 316, 340
visit from Miss Whitney (1862), **1**: 370, 371, 378, 380
lived, with Miss Whitney, at the Brevoort House, New York, for Dr. Barker's care [**1**: (1863), 400–412
birth of her 8th child, Dwight (1863), **1**: 400
moved to new house, Maple St., Springfield (1864), **1**: 390
stayed, with BOWLES, at Dr. Barker's, in New York (1866), **2**: 48
trip, with BOWLES, to the White Mountains (1867), **2**: 55
traveled, with BOWLES and others, in Colorado, California, and Oregon (1869), **2**: [145–147, 154
visited friends in New Jersey, etc. (1871), **2**: 167
urged to travel with husband, daughter, etc., in Europe (1871), **2**: 171, 172
trip, with BOWLES, to Colorado (1871), **2**: 174
—— to California (1873), **2**: 332
urged by BOWLES to visit their oldest daughter, Mrs. Hooker, in Europe (1875), **2**: 346
her delicate health, **1**: 166, 172, 292, 311, 327, 330, 331, 335, 400; **2**: 55, 58, 141, 145, [150, 153, 169, 427
regimen prescribed by her husband, **2**: 169
with her husband in his last illness (1877), **2**: 438
letters from BOWLES, **1**: 205; from Philadelphia (1855), 165, 166, 167; *in* 1857, from Boston, 292, 294; *in* 1860, from Chicago, 303; *in* 1861, during his White Mountain trip, etc., 322–329; during his European trip (1862), 315, 340, 366, 372, 374–377; *in* 1863, while she was in New York, 400–408; *in* 1865, from Washington, 416; *in* 1868, from Colorado, **2**: 57; *in* 1869, from Boston, 144; *in* 1871, from Washington, 168; *in* 1875, from Washington, 345; *in* 1876, from Saratoga and Springfield, 351, 352; *in* 1877, from Cincinnati, etc., 417.
Bowles, Ruth, 9th child of SAMUEL BOWLES, **2**: 140; childhood, 171.
Bowles, Samuel (III.), (1826–1878)

NOTE. *His actions in public matters are in general indexed under the title* SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN.

his ancestry, **1**: 1–4
born at Springfield, Mass. (Feb. 9, 1826), **1**: 1
childhood and youth, **1**: 11–19, 35; **2**: 64, 65
the family home, on Union and School streets; home life, **1**: 15, 34, 57, 204; **2**: 320.

Bowles, Samuel (III.)—*Continued.*
his friends, associates, opponents, etc., **1**: 15, 32, 33; **2**: 327, 443
See, also, besides the list of his correspondents following, and his editorial associates, named under SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN:

Adams, C. F., etc.,
Alexander, Henry, Jr.,
Andrew, J. A.,
Ashmun, George,
Banks, N. P.,
Bartlett, Gen. W. F.,
Beecher, H. W.,
Bill, Mrs. Gurdon,
Brackett, Anna C.,
Briggs, A. D.,
Bristow, B. F.,
Bryan, C. W.,
Butler, B. F.,
Calhoun, Wm. B.,
Chapin, Charles O.,
Chapin, Chester W.
Colfax, Schuyler,
Collins, Wm. S.,
Dana, Charles A.,
Dana, R. H., Jr.,
Davis, Geo. T.,
Dawes, H. L.,
Dickinson, Austin,
Dilke, Sir Charles,
Frothingham, O. B.,
Gillett, Edward B.,
Gladden, Rev. W.,
Greeley, Horace,
Hale, Charles,
Harris, F. H.,
Hawley, J. R.,
Kingsley, Rev. Charle
Leonard, N. A.,
Lincoln, Abraham,
Lincoln, Ezra,
Phelps, Willis,
Reid, Whitelaw,
Rice, Rev. Dr. Wm.,
Shurtleff, Judge W. S.
Smalley, G. W.,
Smith, Dr. D. P.,
Stearns, Pres.,
Storrs, Rev. R. S.,
Sumner, Charles,
Tiffany, Rev. Francis,
Warner, C. D.,
Wayland, Francis,
Weed, Thurlow,
Wells, David D.,
White, Chauncey,
White, Horace.

inherited feeble health from his father, **1**: 4, 18, 22
indisposed to play, or physical exertion, **1**: 16–19; **2**: 64, 65
at school, **1**: 16, 18, 20, 56
denied a college education by his father, **1**: 16, 17, 20; **2**: 46
intended for a printer, **1**: 17
office-boy in the Weekly *Republican* establishment (1843), **1**: 20, 38; **2**: 308
wrote items of local news, **1**: 20, 23
persuaded his father to publish the *Republican* daily, March 27, 1884, **1**: 21
his editorial methods and innovations, **1**: 21, 23, 31, 57, 387
wrote letters to the *Republican* from the South (1844–5), **1**: 22, 50
involved in local controversy about management of the Springfield Armory; antago-
[nized by a rival paper, the Springfield *Evening Gazette (q. v.)* (1846–8), **1**: 23–25.
gave little early promise of his future success in journalism, **1**: 32, 35
married Miss Mary S. D. Schermerhorn, Sept. 6, 1848, **1**: 56
[*References to Mrs.* BOWLES, *their children, and other members of the family are*
[*made under their names severally.*
happy family life, **1**: 56, 204
lived, with his wife, at his father's house (1848–52), **1**: 57
his original salary as editor $500 a year, **1**: 57
bought property in Springfield containing the *Republican* office, and became one-half
[proprietor of the paper, **1**: 57
increased work caused by his father's death (1851), **1**: 59
ill, at his sister's, Mrs. Alexander's, in Brooklyn (1852), **1**: 59, 103
moved his family to his own house, Maple Street, Springfield (1852–64), **1**: 59, 60, 390
home life, devotion to wife and children, **1**: 204, 216, 292, 304, 332–334, 390, 401–408;
[**2**: 55, 70, 73, 75, 139–143, 329
attention to household matters, improvements, gardening, live stock, **1**: 296, 302,
[329, 333, 390, 395, 401, 406, 407, 408, 415; **2**: 50, 55, 141, 172
children trained to household duties, **2**: 140, 150, 157, 329
solicitude to provide for his family, **1**: 306, 393; **2**: 140, 201, 202, 313, 329, 439
moved his home to house on Central Street, built by Rev. F. Tiffany (1864), **1**: 390,
his first editorial writing on politics (1848), **1**: 53 [405, 432
acted with the Whigs, supporting Webster (1850), **1**: 73, 91–96, 192
controversy with an English Abolitionist, George Thompson, who spoke in Springfield
[(1851), **1**: 87–90
took Massachusetts electoral vote to Washington (1852), **1**: 101
trip to Chicago and Falls of St. Anthony (1854), **1**: 101
at Know-nothing Conventions, Philadelphia (1855–6), **1**: 137, 138, 149, 165–167
drafted resolution against extension of Slavery, **1**: 138
held conferences with Massachusetts Whigs as to organizing a Republican Party in
[Massachusetts (1855), **1**: 139, 140
chairman of conference and member of committee to organize an anti-Slavery Party,
[Boston (1855), **1**: 140, 145
asked to conduct Washington bureau of the N. Y. *Tribune* (1856), **1**: 173, 180
opposed nomination of Gardner for Governor of Massachusetts (1856), **1**: 173, 174, 175

Bowles, Samuel (III.)—*Continued.*
supported Fremont for President (1856), **1**: 173–176
urged to establish a newspaper in Philadelphia (1856–57), **1**: 177, 178, 290
editor-in-chief of the Boston *Traveller (q. v.)* (1857), **1**: 181–188, 202, 292
resided in Boston, leaving his family in Springfield (April–Sept., 1857), **1**: 182, 205, 292
ousted from management of the *Traveller* by Gov. Gardner's partisans, **1**: 185, 186, 294
traveled in the West with Charles Allen (1857), **1**: 187, 295
returned to Springfield and work on the *Republican* (1857), **1**: 187, 189, 227, 305
favored S. A. Douglas's reëlection to U. S. Senate, as an opponent of the Buchanan [Administration and of Slavery extension (1857), **1**: 229
trips to New York (1857–9), **1**: 289, 290, 299
—— Boston (1857), **1**: 289, 290, 292
sympathy for John Brown (1859), **1**: 301, 302
underestimated Abraham Lincoln, when nominated and elected (1860), **1**: 281, 318, 319
disbelieved that Secession would occur, **1**: 283, 309, 318, 319
trip to Albany (1860), **1**: 302
—— Chicago (1860), **1**: 303
—— Washington (1860), **1**: 303
his support of the war against Secession and of Lincoln, **1**: 310, 318, 324, 349, 359, [381, 398, 401, 414, 415; **2**: 17
trip on horseback, with E. B. Gillett (1861), **1**: 320
drove, with Charles Allen, to the White Mountains (1861), **1**: 310, 320, 322–326
at water-cure, Northampton, Mass. (1861), **1**: 311, 328–330
in New York, with Mrs. Bowles, for medical treatment, **1**: 311, 330–334
urged by friends to seek rest in foreign travel, **1**: 313, 316
traveled in Europe with his brother, B. F. Bowles (1862), **1**: 315, 340, 357, 359, 364–385
at Bar Harbor, Me. (1863), **1**: 398
relieved himself of routine work by organizing the staff of the *Republican (q. v.)* (1864), [**1**: 387–389, 415
in Washington (1865), **1**: 415–417
—— (1866), **2**: 22
his trip "Across the Continent" (1865), **2**: 1–15
urged forbearance toward Pres. Johnson, and opposed Radicals, **2**: 22, 33, 35, 40, 54,
in New York, with Mrs. Bowles, for medical treatment (1866), **2**: 48
traveled, with Congressional party, in Pennsylvania (1866), **2**: 52
—— his daughter and a party, in Colorado (1868), **2**: 57, 80–85
arrested in New York for libeling "Jim" Fisk (1868), **2**: 95
controversy with David Dudley Field, etc. (1868), **2**: 97–101
worked in Boston, for quiet (1869), **2**: 144
traveled, with Mrs. Bowles and a party, in Colorado, etc. (1869), **2**: 145–147
in New Haven (1869), **2**: 151
in New York (1869–70), **2**: 156
in Washington (1870), **2**: 156
alienated from the Grant Administration and the Republican leaders (1871), **2**: 134, [178, 180
traveled with a nephew, joining his daughter and Miss Whitney, in Germany, and [visiting Switzerland (1870), 160–164
in Hartford (1870), **2**: 165
in Washington (1871), **2**: 168
in England, with his children, Gen. Walker, and a party (1871), **2**: 173, 174
in Colorado, with Mrs. Bowles (1871), **2**: 174
in Washington (1872), **2**: 178
endeavored to effect C. F. Adams's *(q. v.)* nomination for President (1872), **2**: 181, [186, 187, 210, 275, 348
at National Liberal Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1872), **2**: 184–189, 210
disgusted at Greeley's nomination for President, but supported it, as less objection- [able than Grant's, **2**: 187–189, 191–200, 205, 211–217
offended his Republican constituents, **2**: 205, 309
dissolved partnership with his associates in the *Republican* (1872), **2**: 201–209, 307, 308
rupture with his partners, who organized the Springfield *Union*, in opposition to the [*Republican* (1872), **2**: 203–208, 307, 309, 332
traveled with Mrs. Bowles in California (1873), **2**: 232
desired to withdraw from editorship and active business, **2**: 307
asked to become mayor of Springfield; declined (1873), **2**: 309, 310, 311, 332, 355
sued for libel by Willis Phelps, a railroad jobber, whose schemes he opposed (1873–75); [inconclusive results, **2**: 310–313, 315–319, 346, 371
his strength exhausted by the labors of the trial and other cares, **2**: 319, 321, 334

Bowles, Samuel (III.)—*Continued.*
traveled in Europe with C. W. Chapin *(q. v.)* (1874), meeting abroad Mr. and Mrs. [Hooker, Dr. Smith, Smalley, Halstead, etc., **2**: 313, 314, 339–341, 342
opposed election to Congress of his brother-in-law, Henry Alexander, Jr. *(q. v.)*, [causing family estrangement (1874), **2**: 268–270, 272, 314, 315, 342, 343
in Washington (1875), **2**: 239, 345
rupture with his brother, B. F. Bowles *(q. v.)* (1875), who died abroad (1876), **2**: [319–321
supported Hayes for President, but opposed some local Republican nominations [(1876), **2**: 274, 277, 281, 306
his disgust at the disputed Presidential election, and its solution, **2**: 355, 356
in Boston (1876), **2**: 350
had an attack resembling paralysis (1876), **2**: 327
assisted Judge Shurtleff in preparing new charter for Springfield (1876–7), **2**: 323, 324, [410
promoted organization of Springfield Union Relief Association (1876–7), **2**: 325, 326, [410, 422
traveled in Virginia, Kentucky, etc., with Halstead and Watterson (1877), **2**; 416, 420
resolved "against any more journeys of any sort," **2**: 417
increased gentleness of manner, **2**: 425
supported Pres. Hayes's Administration, **2**: 421, 424, 425, 428, 430
at Saratoga, **2**: 426
growing weakness, **2**: 427, 431–434
made his will, **2**: 433
last interviews with friends, **2**: 433
apoplectic attack (Dec. 1, 1877); lingering, **2**: 434–440
instructions as to family affairs, the *Republican*, business matters, etc., **2**: 435, 439
messages and visits from friends, **2**: 435–440
died (Jan. 16, 1878), **2**: 440
a quiet funeral, **2**: 441
sermon referring to his death by the Rev. A. D. Mayo, **2**: 450–454
memorial service, at the Church of the Unity (Jan. 23), **2**: 441–448
physical characteristics, appearance, manners, etc., **1**: 18, 33; **2**: 68, 74, 409
attention to dress, **1**: 18; **2**: 172, 410
dainty as to food, **2**: 11, 74, 77
first break-down in health; traveled in the South (1844–5), **1**: 22, 23
overwork and invalidism, **1**: 32, 34, 35, 57, 59, 60, 65, 66, 104, 211, 299, 305–315, [369, 398; **2**: 15, 49, 60–67, 80, 139–141, 158, 159, 163, 165, 215, 319, 321, 327, 328, [332, 354, 408, 416, 420, 431, 438
nervous tension, developing its effects *in* 1860, **1**: 35, 65, 208, 308, 395, 403; **2**: 70, 427
incapacity for rest, **1**: 65–67, 306–309; **2**: 63
loss of sleep, **1**: 35, 65, 305, 307; **2**: 139
eye troubles, **1**: 59, 103
break-down from rheumatism, abscesses in the head, etc.; ill in Brooklyn (1852), **1**: [59, 103, 163
the "best 15 years of his life" over at 31, **1**: 182
traveled, for rest, in the West, with Charles Allen (1857), **1**: 187, 295
his wife's and children's care for his health, **1**: 206–208; **2**: 139
definite physical break-down (1857), **1**: 305–315, 324–340, 418, 419
sought relief in travel, **1**: 305, 315; **2**: 332
experiments in diet, **1**: 309, 369, 402; **2**: 157, 327, 351, 352, 417, 428
treated by Dr. D. Smith, **1**: 308; **2**: 351, 428
—— Denniston, **1**: 311, 328
—— Fordyce Barker, **1**: 311; **2**: 48
—— Bartholo, **2**: 351
—— Weir Mitchell, **2**: 428
development of his moral nature by physical suffering, **2**: 17, 59–67, 461
morally pure, **2**: 35, 444, 445
fond of social intercourse, of entertaining at his house, etc., **1**: 18, 311, 390, 394, 413; [**2**: 61, 75, 76, 142, 150, 329, 330, 445
—— the theater, **2**: 77, 168
—— riding and driving [*see* PONE], **1**: 104, 297, 298, 308, 310; **2**: 77–79, 142, 412, [434
practical activity, public and private, **2**: 64, 323, 325, 410, 422, 450
his taste in reading, **1**: 18, 19, 217, 317, 335, 336, 394, 399, 411, 415, 419; **2**: 76
his single lapse into verse, **1**: 304

Bowles, Samuel (III.)—*Continued.*
interest in public education, colleges, schools, libraries, etc., **1**: 297; **2**: 79, 323, 451
desired an educational qualification for voters, **2**: 19, 20, 31
disliked miscellaneous reforms and "isms," **1**: 49, 50, 62; **2**: 336
tact and magnetic power in managing men, **1**: 33, 67, 68, 101, 145, 191, 196, 206, 446, [453
intercourse with leading men in travels, political meetings, at Washington, etc., re- [ports of convention, etc., **1**: 34, 53, 138, 195, 206
reported Free-soil campaign meeting, Springfield (1848), **1**: 53
messenger to take Massachusetts electoral vote to Washington (1852), **1**: 101
reported proceedings of the Know-nothing National Council at Philadelphia, for the *Republican*, Boston *Atlas*, and New York *Tribune* (1855–56), **1**: 137, 138, 149, [165, 166, 167
—— commencements at Amherst and Williams Colleges (1855), **1**: 140
—— Democratic National Convention, Cincinnati (1856), **1**: 149, 150
—— first Republican National Convention, Philadelphia (1856), **1**: 150–152
—— Republican National Convention, Chicago (1860), **1**: 262, 303
—— Radical Massachusetts Convention (1866), **2**: 26
—— Democratic National Convention, New York (1868), **2**: 40
—— Liberal Republican National Convention, Cincinnati (1872), **2**: 184, 191, 192
—— Republican National Convention, Philadelphia (1872), **2**: 189, 190, 195, 210
his standing in journalism, as judged after his death, **2**: 448, 449
his books and miscellaneous writings: *Across the Continent* (1865), **2**: 2, 13, 15, 46, 47, 50, 81, 146; *The Switzerland of America* (1868), **2**: 81–85, 146; *The Pacific Railroad Open*, **2**: 81; *Our New West*, **2**: 81, 90, 146.
originally a slow writer and thinker; later ready, fluent, and comprehensive, **1**: 33, [57, 61, 198, 389; **2**: 141
style in writing, clear, observant, shrewd, practical, **1**: 22, 32, 34, 36, 50, 61, 63; **2**: [46, 47, 59, 449, 451, 458
conciseness, epigrammatic power, suggestiveness, **1**: 23, 33, 198, 199; **2**: 359
attention to words, spelling, etc., **2**: 46, 74, 147
methods of office work, **1**: 103; **2**: 64, 68–75, 152
an autocrat, **1**: 213; **2**: 69
power of inspiring his assistants [see SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN: staff], **1**: 109, 213, [387, 389; **2**: 60–74, 359, 404
rapidity of decision, **2**: 198
desire for novelty, **2**: 199
dictated to a stenographer, **1**: 389; **2**: 71, 141, 158, 404, 419 *n*, 428
business integrity, **2**: 445
early religious training, **1**: 12, 13
later religious views, **1**: 337–339, 401, 409, 410, 411, 413; **2**: 80, 159, 323, 382, 394–
conception of immortality, **2**: 438 [402, 460
appeared at times selfish, crusty, proud, and gave offense, **1**: 34, 204, 213; **2**: 458
charms of manner and of conversation, **1**: 207, 208, 211, 213; **2**: 69, 70, 405, 408–415
unwilling to admit himself wrong, **1**: 70, 214; **2**: 361, 408
fond of power and of making it felt, **1**: 72, 203, 207; **2**: 360, 458, 459
alienated friends by unreserved criticism, **1**: 71, 72, 203, 204, 214–216; **2**: 8, 51, 90, [203, 205–208, 309, 321, 327, 360–362, 412, 415
quick in estimating men's character, **1**: 196, 300
mistaken judgments of men, **1**: 196, 281, 318, 319
his conception of journalism, its functions, ethics, etc., **1**: 45, 61, 63, 67, 70, 71, 179, 193, [387, 388; **2**: 95, 99–101, 315, 318, 319, 322, 357–403, 442–447, 456–458
his independence of party, **1**: 45, 62, 67, 68, 69, 96, 168, 171, 192–195, 203, 213–216, [229, 403; **2**: 90, 215, 223, 310, 322, 353, 444, 455
his independence of men, friends, local prejudices: "The *Republican* is one thing, SAM BOWLES another": **1**: 69–72, 195, 203, 214, 215; **2**: 51, 90, 220, 268–270, [272, 314, 315, 322, 381–389, 405, 442, 458
his independence of churches, the clergy, sectarianism, **1**: 62; **2**: 49, 90, 381, 382, [394–403, 452
his duty to lead opinion, **2**: 376–380, 443
his part in the "Independent Journalism" movement of 1872, **1**: 69, 194; **2**: 89, 90, [215, 223, 348, 442, 452, 456
refused to accept political office or patronage, **1**: 67, 299, 300; **2**: 48, 54, 144, 309, [310, 322
his one unfortunate failure to avoid personal obligations (1874), **2**: 314
aptitude for politics, **1**: 61, 67, 68, 101, 138, 145, 191

Bowles, Samuel (III.)—*Continued.*
instinct for getting and presenting news, **1**: 101, 138, 196, 198, 206, 210, 215; **2**: 358, [367, 376
his relations with women:
—— discountenanced "Women's Rights," **1**: 62; **2**: 149, 336
—— women as writers, **1**: 405, 406; **2**: 74, 333, 334
—— cordial, sincere, unaffected, commanding their admiration and respect, [**1**: 209, 216, 217, 311; **2**: 409, 411–413, 426, 446
—— enlisted and aided them in local charities, reforms, etc., **2**: 326, 422
—— sought to enlarge their opportunities in life, **2**: 390, 393
—— his theory of their duties and claims, **2**: 390
—— no admirer of European women, **1**: 370
—— his criticisms on San Francisco women, **2**: 8, 47, 50
objection to divorce, **2**: 159, 389, 390
many and warm friendships, **1**: 204, 206–218, 300; **2**: 442–454, 459, 460
generous in giving money, aid, sympathy, counsel, **1**: 212, 297, 395, 396–398; **2**: 323, [335, 413, 446, 450, 459
trustee of Amherst College (1866–78), **2**: 79
twenty years director of the Springfield city library, **2**: 323
his property in Springfield, **1**: 57
—— real estate, **1**: 57, 393, 394
—— the *Republican* (*q. v.*), **1**: 57
—— depreciation after the Jay Cooke panic (1873), **2**: 313, 327, 335, 354
—— prosperity retrieved (1877), **2**: 416
love for Springfield (*q. v.*), **2**: 309, 323–326, 415, 434
love of nature, scenery, travel, places, men, **1**: 206, 310, 365, 385; **2**: 2–15, 52, 62, 90, [142, 375, 384–389, 415, 425, 440
—— developed in him by his wife, **2**: 142
—— Niagara Falls, **1**: 101, 102; **2**: 12, 84
—— White Mountains, **1**: 323–326
—— England, **1**: 364–367, 385; **2**: 340
—— Germany, **1**: 368
—— Switzerland, **1**: 370–384, 385; **2**: 13, 84
—— Pacific Railroad and the Far West, **2**: 2–1
—— Yo Semite, **2**: 2, 12, 63, 84
—— Rocky Mountains, **2**: 3
—— California, **2**: 4, 6, 47, 50, 51, 145, 332, 386–389
—— San Francisco, **2**: 5, 6, 11, 14, 50
—— Oregon, **2**: 5, 9, 147
—— Washington Territory, **2**: 5, 9
—— Columbia River, **2**: 5
—— Utah and Mormons, **2**: 11
—— Pennsylvania, **2**: 52
—— Colorado, **2**: 57, 80–85, 145
taste for flowers, **1**: 324, 326; **2**: 412
fond of games, chess, cards, etc., **1**: 330; **2**: 77
his views of Slavery:
—— regarded it as worse for masters than for slaves, **1**: 22, 50
—— opposed its extension, disliked its existence, but discountenanced the [Abolitionists, **1**: 47, 50, 53, 73–81, 138–140, 291, 319; **2**: 17
—— resented Southern encroachment and tyranny, **1**: 138, 139, 150
—— gradually came to favor Emancipation as a war measure, **1**: 350–355, 381, [415; **2**: 17
—— care for the welfare of the freedmen, **2**: 17, 23
work as a reformer, **2**: 89–109, 136–138, 351, 367–374, 381–384
—— opposition to jobs, rings, etc., 89, 93–106, 167, 168, 219, 276, 310–319, 331, [343–372
to demagogues [*see* Butler, B. F.], 89–93, 96
—— to pseudo-dignitaries, either in church or state, **2**: 381
—— to sham, **2**: 444, 446, 452
—— to political corruption, **2**: 89
—— Grant's Administration [*see* Grant], **2**: 89, 423
civil service reform (*q. v.*), **2**: 89
his letters to family and friends, **1**: 205, 209, 289, 308; (1851–56), 162–178; (1857–60), [289–304; (1860–62), 313, 316–340, 398; (1862), 364–385; (1863–64), 386–419; **2**: 60, [331, 425; (1865–68), 46–58; (1869–71), 143–173; (1872), 210–221; (1873–76), 331–[356; (1877), 417–432

Bowles, Samuel (III.)—*Continued.*

[These letters are severally indexed under the names of the receivers, viz.:

Allen, Charles,
Bartlett, D. W.,
Bartlett, W. F.,
Booth, Newton,
Bowles, Mrs. M. E. S.,
Bowles (Mrs. Hooker),
Bryan, C. W.,
Calhoun, Mrs. L. G.,
Dawes, Henry L.,
Halstead, Murat,
Hayes, R. B.,
Hooker Mr. and Mrs. Thos.,
Hooker, Mrs. Isabella Beecher,
Huntington, Dr. F. D.,
Nordhoff, Charles,
Pierce, John,
Pomeroy, Robert,
Runkle, Mrs.,
Sanborn, F. B.,
Schurz, Carl,
Schuyler, Louisa Lee,
Smalley, G. W.,
Spofford, Henry M.,
Springfield *Republican*,
Tiffany, Rev. Francis,
Watterson, Henry,
Whitney, Maria.]

Bowles, Samuel (IV.), 2d child and oldest son of SAMUEL BOWLES, born (1851), **1**: 58; in Germany, with his sister Sarah A. and Miss Whitney (1869), **2**: 148, 152; traveled, with his father, sister, etc., in Switzerland (1870), 160; with his father in England (1871), 173; began work on the *Republican* (1873), 308; advised by his father on his death-bed as to family matters, the *Republican*, business, etc. (Dec. 1, 2, 1877), 435, 439.

Bowles, Sarah Augusta, oldest child of SAMUEL BOWLES; born (1850), **1**: 58; her father's fondness for her in babyhood, 58; visited Geneva, N. Y. (1867), **2**: 55; traveled with her father and others in Colorado, etc. (1868), 58, 81, 145, 329; assisted her mother in household management, 140; in Europe, with Miss Whitney (1869–1871), 147, 148, 160; joined by her father, and traveled with him in Switzerland (1870), 160, 171; with her father in England (1871), 173; returned from Europe (1871), 329; kept house for her father in Springfield (1872), 215. married Thomas Hooker, of New Haven (June, 1874), 329; letters from her father (1861), from New York, **1**: 322; *in* 1862, from Europe, 378; *in* 1869, from Colorado and Oregon, **2**: 145, 147; *in* 1869, while she was in Europe, 150, 151, 152, 156, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171.

[*Further entries under* HOOKER.]

Boyd, Rev. A. K. H., of Edinburgh, Scotland; entertained BOWLES at Edinburgh (1862), **1**: 370.

Brackett, Miss Anna C.; her book, **2**: 336; wrote letter read at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 442, 446.

Bradley, Joseph, Republican, of New Jersey, Justice U. S. Supreme Court; made member of the Presidential Electoral Commission, in place of David Davis (1876), **2**: 295, 296; voted with Republicans, insuring "8 to 7" vote, 297, 298, 299; rebuked for partisanship, 300, 301.

Brazil, Emperor of; arbitrated between the United States and Great Britain in the matter of the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), **2**: 121.

Breckinridge, John C., M. C. from Kentucky; led opposition to exclusion of slavery from the territories (1854), **1**: 116; Democratic candidate for Vice-president; elected (1856), 150, 160; influence in Kentucky, 228; nominated for President by the Baltimore (anti-Douglas) Democratic National Convention (1860), 261; evaded inquiry whether Lincoln's election would produce Secession, 265; defeated by Lincoln, 268.

Briggs, A. D., of Springfield; member of "The Club," **2**: 76; presided at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441.

Bright, John, of England; favored amicable arbitration of the *Alabama* claims (1868), **2**: 119; literary power, 182.

Bristow, Benjamin F., of Louisville, Kentucky; Secretary of the Treasury in President Grant's Cabinet (1874), **2**: 232; favored moderation in Louisiana political conflict (1875), 236; his conduct of the Treasury praised by the *Republican*, 240, 243, 253, 261; sought resumption of specie payment, 243; repressed corruption in his department, 243, 251, 253; attacked the "Whisky Ring," 246, 251, 253; meeting with BOWLES in Washington (1875), 345; urged as candidate for the Presidency by reformers, 253, 254, 259, 274, 275, 349; candidate for Presidential nomination, National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), 259, 260; his secretaryship given to Senator Morrill, of Maine, 261; his supporters in the departments punished by the Grant Administration, 280; supported Hayes in the canvass, 281; visit from BOWLES, Halstead, and Watterson, in Louisville (1877), 417.

Brooks, James, M. C. from New York; a government director of the Union Pacific R. R., **2**: 227; his expulsion recommended, for implication in Credit Mobilier bribery, but changed to vote of "absolute condemnation" (1872), 227; death, 227, 228.

Brooks, Preston S., M. C. from South Carolina; assailed Charles Sumner in U. S. Senate Chamber (1856), **1**: 146; **2**: 197; applauded by the South, 147; sent challenge for a duel to Wilson, who declined, 147; sent challenge to Burlin-

game, but refused to fight when it was accepted, 147.
Bross, Lieutenant-Governor of Illinois, of the Chicago *Tribune;* on the tour "Across the Continent" (1865), **2**: 1; on excursion to Colorado, with BOWLES and Colfax (1868), 80.
Brown, Aaron V., of Tennessee, Postmaster-General in Pres. Buchanan's Cabinet (1857), **1**: 224.
Brown, B. Gratz, of Missouri; joined Carl Schurz in the Liberal Republican movement (1872), **2**: 177; sought Presidential nomination at Cincinnati National Convention (1872), 185, 186; withdrew his name in favor of Horace Greeley, 186; nominated for Vice-president, 187; defeat of the ticket, 199, 200.
Brown, John, of Kansas, **1**: 247–255; led an anti-Slavery raid on Harper's Ferry, Va. (1859), 247; alarm of the South, 219, 248, 251, 258; held by the South to represent the Republican party, 248, 251, 254, 256; lightly estimated at the North, 248; his character and purposes, 197, 249, 301; his character estimated by the *Republican*, 251, 254, 267; trial, 252; execution, 253, 302; its effect at the North, 254.
Browne, Albert G., Jr., of Boston; attempted rescue of Burns, fugitive slave, in Boston (1854), **1**: 119; visit from BOWLES (1875), **2**: 345.
Brownlow, William G. ("Parson" B.), Governor of Tennessee; urged violent measures, confiscation, disfranchisement, etc. (1866), **2**: 27; repressed the Kuklux (1869), 126.
Bryan, Clark W., editor of the *Berkshire Courier*, Great Barrington, Mass., **1**: 102; assistant editor of the *Republican* (1852–7), 102–104, 109, 182; joint proprietor and publisher of the *Republican*, 103; **2**: 201, 202; notified of dissolution of partnership by BOWLES (1872), **2**: 203; engaged in rival newspaper, the Springfield *Union* (1872), 204–209, 332; preserved personal relations with BOWLES, 206; urged BOWLES's nomination for Mayor of Springfield (1873), 332; reminiscences of BOWLES, 101; letters to and from BOWLES, **1**: 312–314, 331; **2**: 145, 170, 204, 332.
Bryant, William Cullen, editor of the N. Y. *Evening Post;* independence in journalism, **2**: 133; hatred for Greeley, 192; rebuked Pres. Grant's military interference in Louisiana politics (1875), 235; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; address on Goethe (1875), 393.

Buchanan, James (1791–1868), of Pennsylvania; President of the United States [(1857–61)
political antecedents, **1**: 149
Minister to England under Pres. Pierce, **1**: 149
sought acquisition of Cuba as a Slave state, **1**: 149
personal respectability, **1**: 149
weakness of character, **1**: 224, 227, 233, 242, 278
subservient to the South, **1**: 224, 242
partisan use of patronage, **1**: 134, 224
Democratic candidate for President; elected (1856), **1**: 149, 154, 160, 219.
received vote of all Southern disunionists, **1**: 154
election caused by defection of the American party from the Republicans, **1**: 159
last victory of the pro-Slavery parties, **1**: 219, 244, 291
his inaugural address, referring debatable points concerning Slavery to the U. S. [Supreme Court (March 4, 1857), **1**: 219
his Cabinet, **1**: 224, 278
withdrawal of its Secession members, and admission of loyal men, **1**: 278
furthered Slavery interests in Kansas, **1**: 219, 224–231
sought admission of Kansas as a Slave state, **1**: 227, 242, 244
his treachery exposed by Gov. Robert J. Walker, **1**: 227
his pro-Slavery measures opposed by S. A. Douglas, **1**: 228, 229, 233, 242, 245, 259, 262
lost support of the country (1858), **1**: 244, 245
averse to disunion, but helpless, **1**: 224, 276, 278

Buckingham, Rev. Dr. G. S., of Springfield; member of "The Club," **2**: 76.
Bullock, Alex. H., of Worcester; Governor of Massachusetts (1866–8), **2**: 106; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), 274; proposed candidate for U. S. senatorship (1877), 356.
Burlingame, Anson P., M. C. from Massachusetts; joined the Know-nothing party (1854), **1**: 124, 125; challenged Brooks, of South Carolina, for his assault on Sumner (1856), 147; favored S. A. Douglas's reëlection to U. S. Senate (1857), 229.
Burns, Anthony, fugitive slave, arrested in Boston (1854), **1**: 119: rendition to Slavery, 121; political consequences in Massachusetts (1855), 132.
Bushnell, Rev. Horace, of Hartford, Conn.; his book, "The Vicarious Sacrifice" (1864), **1**: 419.

Butler, Andrew P., U. S. Senator from South Carolina; declared the slave-holders' claim in the territories (1854), **1**: 115; attacked in debate by Charles Sumner (1856), 146; applauded Preston S. Brooks's assault upon Sumner (1856), 147; threatened Secession in case of Republican success (1856), 147.

Butler, Benjamin F., of Massachusetts, delegate to Democratic National Convention, Charleston (April, 1860), **1**: 259; member of anti-Douglas minority in adjourned Convention, Baltimore (June, 1860), 261; protested against admission of Douglas delegates, was outvoted, and seceded with other Massachusetts delegates, 261; joined Convention of anti-Douglas seceders at Baltimore, 261; Breckinridge-Democrat candidate for Governor; defeated (1860), 268; absent from Democratic State Convention (1861), 356; General in the Union Army, 356, **2**: 91; his dramatic successes, 91; military failures, 91; imputed dishonesty, 91; presided at Massachusetts Republican Convention (1866), 26; an ultra-Republican leader in Congress, 26, 27, 38, 40, 91, 92, 118, 229, 232, 239; a manager of the impeachment of President Johnson (1868), 35; his mendacious report of the trial, 39; powers of vituperation, slander, and lying, 92, 93; stimulated anti-Southern feeling, 92, 239, 240; supported the Force Bill (1875), 239; devised evasions of paying the war debt, 92, 106; favored currency inflation, 229, 232; courted anti-Slavery men, 92, 106; the ignorant rabble, 26, 92, 93, 106, 232; seekers of impracticable reforms, 106; American fishery interest, 122; supported by Republican leaders, 92, 93, 108, 143, 239, 264; by personal following of local spoilsmen, 107; by adherents to "the regular ticket," 107; by the Grant Administration, 264, 266; (Republican) candidate for reëlection to Congress (1868); elected, 92, 93; sought (Republican) nomination for Governor (1871), 72, 73; defeated, 106–108, 136, 214, 264; defeated for reëlection to Congress (1874), 272; supported Boutwell for U. S. Senator (1876), 275; member of Massachusetts Republican Central Committee (1876), 275; elected (Republican) member of Congress (1876), 275, 277; opposed Hayes's principles in Presidential campaign (1876), 281; elected (Democratic) Governor, 107; his political "management," 107, 108; opposed by the *Republican* and by BOWLES, **1**: 393; **2**: 26, 89, 91, 92, 93, 407, 435; by the N. Y. *Nation*, 92; by R. H. Dana, 92; Gen. G. H. Gordon, 92, 275; by Gen. J. R. Hawley, 92; by Edward Atkinson, 92; by H. L. Dawes, 118, 143; by E. R. Hoar, 275; by J. F. Clarke, 265, 275; by H. L. Pierce, 275; causes of his popularity, **1**: 393; **2**: 91, 106, 421; his message to BOWLES on his death-bed, 435.

Calhoun, John C., U. S. Senator from South Carolina; demanded in Congress universal protection for Slavery (1847), **1**: 75; claimed independent sovereignty for each state, 80; taught the South an aggressive policy, 112; non-conception of Slavery, Emancipation, and the Consolidated Union, 197.

Calhoun, Mrs. L. G.; *afterward* Mrs. Runkle *(q. v.)*, **2**: 154.

Calhoun, Wm. B., of Springfield, **1**: 35; writer for the *Republican*, 35, 45; death (Nov. 9, 1865), 36; obituary by BOWLES, 36.

California, obtained, as a result of the war with Mexico (1846–8), **1**: 47, 74
purpose to establish Slavery in, **1**: 74, 75
claimed admission as a State, with an anti-Slavery constitution, **1**: 75, 76
its admission as a Free State favored by Henry Clay, as a part of his Compromise [Resolutions (1849–50), **1**: 76; favored by the *Republican*, 76, 79
elections carried by the Americans (Know-nothings) (1855), **1**: 144
BOWLES's 1st trip to (1865) [*see also* SAN FRANCISCO], **2**: 4–15
local resentment at BOWLES's criticisms [*see also* BOWLES], **2**: 47, 51
Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES traveled in (1869), **2**: 145
BOWLES's later impressions of, **2**: 386–389

Calvinism [*see* NEW ENGLAND].

Cambridge, Mass.; BOWLES's liking for the place, **2**: 157.

Cameron ("Don,") J. Donald, Republican U. S. Senator from Pennsylvania; ignored Hayes's principles of Reform (1876), **2**: 281; ignored by Hayes's Administration (1877), 304.

Cameron, Simon, of Pennsylvania; led Pennsylvania delegation in Republican National Convention (1860), **1**: 263; a candidate for Presidential nomination, 263; was promised a Cabinet office if he secured Lincoln's nomination, 263; made Secretary of War in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), 282; influence with Grant's Administration, **2**: 115; made chairman of Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, *vice* Sumner, 130; his political record, 131.

Canada, Dominion of; disputes with the United States about fisheries and boundary settled by the Treaty of Washington (1871), **2**: 120–123; escape of fugitive slaves to, **1**: 114

Carpenter, Matthew H., U. S. Senator from Wisconsin; influence with Pres.

Grant's administration, **2**: 115; sustained Grant in displacing Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), 130; favored moderation in Louisiana political conflict (1875), 236.
"**Carpet-bag**" government, **2**: 124, 126; supported by Republican leaders and the Grant Administration, 127, 131.
Cary, Alice, of New York; writer for the *Republican*, **2**: 389; Sunday-night receptions, 151.
Casey, F. F., brother-in-law of Pres. Grant; appointed Collector of the Port of New Orleans, **2**: 131; scandalous interference in party politics, 131; used Federal troops to exclude opposition delegates from the Republican Convention (1871), 131; promoted Kellogg's usurpation of the Governorship of Louisiana (1872), 224.
Cass, Lewis, U. S. Senator from Michigan; Democratic candidate for President (1848), **1**: 52; defeated by Taylor, 55; favored extension of Slavery (1854), 116, 150; theory of "squatter sovereignty" attributed to him by the *Republican* (1856), 150; Secretary of State in Pres. Buchanan's Cabinet (1857), 224; left Cabinet, disgusted at Buchanan's refusal to reënforce Fort Sumter (1859), 278.
Cato, Chief-Justice of Kansas (1857); supported fraudulent election returns, **1**: 226.
"**Caucuses**" in American politics, **2**: 270, *n.*; revolt against, in Massachusetts (1873), 271, 274.
Century Magazine, The, of New York; Dr. J. G. Holland's connection with, **1**: 202.
Chadborne, Paul A., of Williamstown, Mass.; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), **2**: 274.
Chaffee, Dr. C. C., of Springfield, Mass.; elected to Congress as a Know-nothing (1855), **1**: 126; Republican and American nominee for Congress; elected (1856), 156, 160.
Chamberlain, Daniel H., of Massachusetts; Republican Governor of South Carolina, **2**: 279; good administration, 279; reëlection opposed by Gen. Wade Hampton (1876), 279; supported by troops sent by Pres. Grant, but withdrawn by Hayes, 279, 282, 289, 305; excluded Democrats from the Legislature, 289; recognized as Governor by the purged Legislature, 289; repudiated by the seceding Democratic Legislature, 289; discountenanced by Pres. Hayes, 302, 305; collapse of his government, 305.
Chancellorsville, Va., battle of, **1**: 343.
Chandler, William E., Republican, of New Hampshire; ignored by Hayes's Administration (1877), **2**: 304.
Chandler, Zachariah, U. S. Senator from Michigan; influence with Pres. Grant's Administration, **2**: 115; sustained Grant in displacing Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), 130; Secretary of the Interior in Grant's Cabinet (1875), 252; his character drawn by the *Republican*, 252; political use of official patronage, 252, 280; manager of the Republican Presidential canvass (1876), 280; disregard of Hayes's pledges of reform, 280, 281; ignored by Hayes as President, 304.
Chapin, Charles O., of Springfield, Mass.; friend of Bowles from boyhood, **1**: 16; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), **2**: 274.
Chapin, Chester W., of Springfield; skill in whist, **2**: 77; success in railroads, 268; president of Boston and Albany R. R., 268, 276; Democratic nominee for Congress (1873), 268; supported by the *Republican* against H. Alexander, Jr., Bowles's brother-in-law, 268, 269, 314, 342, 343, 349; elected, 272; services in Congress, 275, 276; supported by the *Republican* for reëlection (1876); defeated, 275, 277; traveled in Europe, with Bowles as his guest (1874), 313, 314, 339, 340; charged with railroad jobbery in Massachusetts (1876), 276, 314, 349; defended by the *Republican*, 314.
Chapman, Reuben A., of Springfield; Chief-Justice of Massachusetts, **1**: 39, 297; as Whig, repudiated Free-soil and American parties (1856), 153; founded "The Club," Springfield, **2**: 76.
Charleston, S. C.; crew of the slaver *Echo* acquitted by a jury, **1**: 247; Democratic National Convention, split, adjourned to Baltimore (1860), 259–261; Fort Sumter, held by Major Anderson, U. S. A., attacked and taken by Confederates, precipitating the war (April, 1861), 278–288, 309.
Chase, Salmon P., of Ohio; delegate to National Free-soil Convention, Albany (1848), **1**: 52; supported Van Buren and Adams, Presidential candidates, 52; opposed Douglas's Popular Sovereignty doctrine, in U. S. Senate (1854), 115, 116; opposed Slavery, 115, 139, 415; **2**: 41; nominated for Governor, on platform of "Denationalization" (of Slavery) (1855), 139; his statesmanlike methods in politics, 190; candidate for Presidential nomination, Chicago Republican Convention (1860), 263; **2**: 41; rivalry with Seward, **1**: 263; made Secretary of the Treasury in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), 282, 318, 346; leader in the "extreme right" of Republican party (1863), 390; made Chief-Justice of U. S. Supreme Court by Pres. Lincoln, 415; **2**: 41; opposed Lincoln as President (1864), **1**: 413; presided, as Chief-Justice, in impeachment trial of Pres. Johnson (1868), **2**: 35, 41; denounced the Thad Stevens wing of Republican party, 40; sought Presidential nomination from

Democrats (1868), 40, 41; defeated for nomination by Horatio Seymour, 41.
Cheever, Rev. Dr. George B., of New York; preached duty of emancipation in Fast Day sermon (1861), **1**: 351.
Chestnut, James J., U. S. Senator from South Carolina; resigned senatorship when South Carolina seceded (1860), **1**: 273.
Chicago, visits of Bowles to (1854), **1**: 101; *in* 1860, 262, 303; **2**: 1; *in* 1877, 416; National Republican Convention, nominating Lincoln for President (1860), **1**: 262–264, 303; National Democratic Convention, nominating McClellan for President (1864), 359; National Republican Convention, nominating Grant for President (1868), **2**: 38–40, 42.
Chicago Times, its obituary of Bowles (1878), **2**: 449.
Chicago Tribune, represented by Lieut.-Gov. Bross on the trip *Across the Continent* (1865), **2**: 1; a leader in the "Independent Journalism" movement, 133; urged formation of a new party to promote reform (1870), 135; promoted the Liberal Republican movement and its Cincinnati Convention (1872), 178; reluctantly supported Greeley, when nominated, 187; returned to Republicanism after Grant's reëlection, 223; furthered Blaine's political aspirations (1873), 333; opposed the Grant Administration's Force bill (1875), 238; opposed Sherman's Resumption of Specie Payment bill (1875), 241; favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), 253; only leading Republican paper to protest against frauds by Republican Returning Boards in Hayes-Tilden Presidential election, 287.
Chinese in the Pacific states, **2**: 387.
Choate, Rufus, of Boston, Mass., **1**: 299, 300; Parker's *Life* of, 301; the *Republican* on his *Glory and Shame as a Lawyer* (1859), **2**: 384.
Churches [*see* Religion].
Church Monthly, New York; controversy with the *Republican* about Episcopacy (1861), **2**: 397–401.
Cincinnati, O.; Democratic National Convention, nominating Buchanan (1856), **1**: 149, 151, 172, 260, 261; Liberal Republican National Convention, nominating Greeley (1872), **2**: 177, 180–187, 210–213; Republican National Convention, nominating Hayes (1876), 259, 260; visits by Bowles to, *in* 1856, **1**: 149; *in* 1872, **2**: 184, 188, 191, 192, 210; *in* 1877, 417, 418.
Cincinnati Commercial [*see also* Halstead, M.]; a leader in the "Independent Journalism" movement, **2**: 133, 154, 178, 348; promoted the Liberal Republican movement and its Cincinnati Convention (1872), 178; favored C. F. Adams's nomination for President, 181, 186; thwarted nomination of Gratz Brown, 186; reluctantly supported Greeley when nominated, 187, 191, 192; returned to Republicanism after Grant's reëlection, 223; opposed currency inflation, as advocated by Gov. Allen and the Democrats (1875), 244; supported Hayes for President (1876), 280; opposed Southern control of the government and finances, 280; favored an Electoral Commission to determine the Hayes-Tilden disputed election, 293.
Cincinnati Gazette, favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), **2**: 253; opposed Electoral Commission to determine the disputed Hayes-Tilden Presidential election (1876), 293.
Civil Service, public offices used for political corruption under the Grant Administration, **2**: 132, 249, 251; efforts at its reform, 132, 230, 232; measures urged by the "independent journals," 133; reforms obstructed by Pres. Grant, his favorites, and the Republican leaders, 230, 232, 251, 252, 255; Reform Conference held in New York (April, 1876), 254, 349; advocates of reform in Republican National Convention (June, 1876), 259, 260, 261; reform measures promised in Hayes's letter accepting the Presidential nomination (1876), 262, 263; reform ignored by the Republican managers of the campaign, who were ignored by Pres. Hayes when elected, 278, 281, 304; reform inaugurated by Pres. Hayes, 306, 421, 422.
Claflin, William, Governor of Massachusetts (1868–71), **2**: 106, 144; reproached for supporting B. F. Butler (1868), 93; vetoed the Hartford and Erie R. R. job (1869), 105; declined renomination for Governor (1871), 108.
Clarendon, Lord, Foreign Secretary of Gladstone Ministry; negotiated arbitration treaty with Reverdy Johnson (1869), **2**: 120; treaty rejected by U. S. Senate, 120.
Clark, Edward P., associate editor of the *Republican*, **2**: 308.
Clarke, James Freeman, of Jamaica Plain, Mass.; opposed the Hartford and Erie R. R. job (1869), **2**: 105; delegate to Republican State Convention (1873), 265; maintained right to "bolt" bad nominations, 265; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), 274; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), 275; took the stump against Butler for Congress (1876), 275.
Clay, Henry, U. S. Senator from Kentucky; Whig candidate for the Presidency (1844), **1**: 45; ambiguous position on annexation of Texas, 45; defeated by Polk, through defection of the "Liberty Party," 46; supported by the *Republican* in its first issue, March 29, 1844, 46;

his advocacy of protective tariff, 46; defeated for Presidential nomination by Taylor (1848), 51; his compromise resolutions as to Slavery (1849-50), 75, 76, 77; non-conception of Secession and Emancipation, 197.

Clayton, Powell, Republican U. S. Senator from Arkansas; supported Grant's Administration, **2**: 238; desired Congress to repudiate the Arkansas state government, 238.

Cleveland, Rev. Dr., of New Haven, Conn.; preached duty of emancipation in Fast Day sermon (1861), **1**: 351.

Cleveland, O., Herald, favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), **2**: 253.

Clifford, Nathan, Justice U. S. Supreme Court, Democrat, **2**: 292; member of the Electoral Commission (1876), 292, 294, 296, 300.

"Club, The," of Springfield; founded by Judge Chapman and frequented by BOWLES, **2**: 76.

Cobb, Howell, of Georgia; Secretary of the Navy in Buchanan's Cabinet (1857), **1**: 224.

Colfax, Schuyler, M. C. from Indiana; a Republican leader, **1**: 229; Speaker of the House (1863-8), **2**: 42, 118; favored reëlection to the Senate of S. A. Douglas (Dem.) (1857), 229; on an excursion "Across the Continent," with BOWLES and others (1865), 1-15, 147; his speech-making, 15; BOWLES's book, *Across the Continent*, dedicated to him, 2; nominated for Vice-president, with Grant as President; elected (1868), 39, 42; ambitious to be President, 55; replaced by Wilson as Vice-president at Grant's second election (1872), 189; on an excursion to Colorado with BOWLES, etc. (1868), 80; on an excursion to Colorado, California, and Oregon, with Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES, Mrs. Colfax, etc. (1869), 145, 147; popular in the West, 147; involved in the Credit Mobilier bribery scandal (1872), 227; friendship with BOWLES, **1**: 197, 415, 416, 417; **2**: 56, 169; believed by BOWLES to be guilty of falsehood in the Credit Mobilier affair (1872), 228.

Collins, Wm. S., of Springfield; his office one of BOWLES's resorts, **2**: 78; reminiscences of BOWLES, 78.

Colorado [*see also* DENVER], BOWLES's impressions of (1865), **2**: 3, 5, 150, 174
—— 2d visit to (1868), 57, 80-85
disturbances from Indians, 57, 83
Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES traveled in (1869, '71), 145, 147, 150, 174.

Columbia River, BOWLES's visit to and impressions (1865), **2**: 5, 13.

Committees, non-official, in American politics, **2**: 270, *n.*

Congdon, Charles T., of the N. Y. *Tribune*; his *Reminiscences* quoted, **2**: 377.

Confederacy, *or* Confederate States of America; *see* SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY.

Conkling, Roscoe, Republican U. S. Senator from New York; influence with President Grant's Administration, **2**: 115, 304; sustained Grant in displacing Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), 130; sustained by Grant, in New York politics, against Fenton, 132, 176, 183, 259; his nominee, "Tom" Murphy, dismissed from the collectorship of New York, 132; supported the Force bill (1875), 240; sought Presidential nomination (1876), 250, 255, 259, 260; on joint Committee of Conference as to disputed Presidential election, 288; advocated bill creating the Electoral Commission, 293, 294; excluded from the Commission, 295; evaded vote on legality of Louisiana Returning Board, 298; ignored by the Hayes Administration, 304, 423; BOWLES's estimate of his character and powers (1877), 423, 424.

Connecticut, Hubbard nominated for Governor by the Democrats (1876), **2**: 281; voted for Tilden (Dem.) for President, 283.

Connor, Selden, Republican Governor of Maine; appointed James G. Blaine Senator from Maine, *vice* Morrill (1876), **2**: 261, 262.

Cook, Mrs. Frances E., literary editor of the *Republican*, **1**: 324, 325, 388, 415.

Cooke (Jay) & Co., bankers, of Philadelphia, Pa.; their failure produces general financial panic (1873), **2**: 232.

Cooper, Peter, of New York; attended Reform Conference, N. Y. (1876), **2**: 254.

Copeland, A. M., of Springfield, Massachusetts; counsel for Willis Phelps in libel suit against BOWLES (1875), **2**: 316.

Corbett, Henry W., U. S. Senator from Oregon; visit in Washington from BOWLES (1871), **2**: 168.

Cox, Gen. J. D., of Ohio; Secretary of the Interior in Grant's Cabinet (1868), **2**: 113; attempted administrative reform, but was removed, 113, 129; declined nomination for Vice-president by Liberal Republican Convention (1872), 187.

Cox, Samuel S., M. C. from New York; chairman of Financial Committee (1875), **2**: 249.

Creswell, A. J., of Maryland; Postmaster-General in Grant's Cabinet (1868), **2**: 113, 170.

Crittenden, John J., U. S. Senator from Kentucky; elected Senator by the American party, **1**: 230; his course as to the admission of Kansas to the Union (1857), 230; his plan for averting Secession (1861), 279, 283.

Cronin, a Democratic electoral candidate in Oregon (1876), **2**: 291; defeated in election, but appointed by Gov. Grover in place of a Republican elector declared ineligible, 291; repudiated by the two Republican electors chosen, 291; named a board, which cast Oregon's vote, as certified by Gov. Grover, 291; vote rejected by Electoral Commission, 299.

Cuba, its annexation by the United States sought by pro-Slavery men, **1**: 149; project of the Buchanan Administration to buy it, 246; importation of slaves to, 246.

Curtis, Benjamin R., of Massachusetts, Justice U. S. Supreme Court; dissented from Chief-Justice Taney's decision in Dred Scott case (1857), **1**: 220, 221; President Johnson's counsel in impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 35.

Curtis, George T., of New York; rebuked Pres. Grant's military interference in Louisiana politics (1875), **2**: 235.

Curtis, George William, of New York; head of commission for Civil Service Reform (1869), **2**: 117; wrote for reform in *Harper's Weekly* (1872), 197; resigned from Civil Service Commission (1873), 230; president of Republican State Convention (1875), 246; censured by the *Republican* for opposing Gov. Tilden's reforms, 247; denounced corruption of the Grant Administration in the N. Y. Republican Convention (1876), 255; opposed Conkling's nomination for President in Cincinnati Convention (1876), 259; his eulogy of Wendell Phillips, 384; estimate of him by BOWLES, 424.

Cushing, Caleb, of Massachusetts; general in the war with Mexico, **1**: 48; Democratic candidate for Governor of Massachusetts (1847), 48; his estimate of Abraham Lincoln *in* 1850, 240; pro-slavery views, 130; **2**: 231; Attorney-General in President Pierce's Cabinet (1854), **1**: 130; charged Republicans with enmity to the Constitution (1859), 259; president of the National Democratic Convention, Charleston (1859), 261; joined the anti-Douglas seceders from the convention, 261; wrote to Jeff. Davis a letter favoring Secession (1861), **2**: 231; favored support of the government when Sumter was attacked (1861), **1**: 355; **2**: 231; absent from Massachusetts Democratic Convention (1861), 356; nominated by Pres. Grant for Attorney-General; withdrawn (1873), **2**: 231.

Dana, Charles A., managing editor of the N. Y. *Tribune*, under Greeley, **1**: 29, 173; advised BOWLES in business matters, 177, 178, 290, 300; meetings with BOWLES (1861), 331; (*in* 1868), **2**: 56.

Dana, Richard H., Jr., of Massachusetts, defended Anthony Burns, fugitive remanded to Slavery, Boston (1854), **1**: 119; on a committee to organize a new political party (1855), 140; Independent Republican candidate for Congress, against B. F. Butler (1868); defeated, **2**: 92, 93; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), 274; favored nomination of Bristow for President, 274; defended BOWLES in libel suit of Willis Phelps (1875), 316.

Davis, David, of Illinois, proposed nominee for President, Liberal Republican National Convention (1872), **2**: 185; nomination thwarted by the independent journals, 185; was expected to be neutral representative of U. S. Supreme Court on Electoral Commission (1876), 292, 293, 295; elected U. S. Senator by Democratic votes, 295; replaced on Electoral Commission by Justice Bradley, Republican, 295.

Davis, George T., of Greenfield, Mass., impressed Thackeray by his brilliant table-talk, **1**: 43; his business judgment esteemed by BOWLES, 177; his social tastes, 370; his funeral commemoration by BOWLES and other friends, **2**: 441.

Davis, Jefferson, of Mississippi, Secretary of War in Pres. Pierce's Cabinet (1853), **1**: 130; moved resolutions in U. S. Senate, embodying the Southern demand concerning Slavery (1859), 256; threatened disunion, 259; made President of the Southern Confederacy (1861), 274; ordered attack on Fort Sumter, 288; personally hated in the North after the war, **2**: 21, 183, 250; released from prison, on bail given by Horace Greeley, 183; his exclusion from amnesty urged by Senator Blaine (1875), 250.

Davis, Samuel H., assistant editor of the *Republican*, **1**: 57; died (1850), 58.

Dawes, Henry L., of Pittsfield, Mass.; supported Scott against Webster for Presidential nomination, in Whig National Convention (1852), **1**: 94; on committee to organize a new political party (1855), 140; Republican candidate for Congress; elected (1856), 156, 160, 175, 176; urged by the *Republican* as candidate for Governor (1860), 266; presided in Massachusetts Republican Convention (1861), 356; member of Congress, **2**: 57, 199; reproached for supporting B. F. Butler (1868), 93; opposed Butler's nomination for Governor (1871), 108; defeated by Blaine for Speakership of the House (1869), 118, 143, 144; chairman of Committee on Appropriations (1869), 118; opposed the government estimates in appropriation bills, 118, 332; in ill-favor with Grant's Administration, 118; attacked by B. F. Butler in the House (1870), 118; upheld by the *Republican*, 118; champion of economical administration, 118; opposed Greeley for President (1872), 197, 199, 206; connection with the Credit Mobilier trans-

action, 217–219, 227, 264; defeated by Boutwell for the U. S. senatorship (1873), 264, 331; Republican leader of the House (1874), 232; opposed the Force bill (1875), 239, 273; opposed the Resumption bill, 242; carried bill for tariff reduction, 273; candidate for senatorship vacated by Sumner's death (1873), 266; supported for senatorship by B. F. Butler, 266, 277; defeated by Gov. Washburn, 267; declined reëlection to the House, 267, 341; unqualified support of Grant Republicanism, 272, 350, 431; candidate for senatorship to succeed Washburn; elected (1874), 267, 273, 341; drew platform of Massachusetts Republican Convention (1875), 273; supported bill creating the Electoral Commission, after seeking to amend (1876), 294; work for the *Republican*, **1**: 103, 156; friendship with Bowles, 210; **2**: 405; visits from Bowles at North Adams, 210; 56; meetings with Bowles in Washington (1871), 169; conflicts of opinion with Bowles, 405; letters from Bowles *in* 1855, **1**: 167, 160; *in* 1856, 171, 173, 176; *in* 1857, 291; *in* 1858, 295; *in* 1859, 298; *in* 1861, 318, 320; *in* 1868, **2**: 57; *in* 1869, 143, 144; *in* 1872, 211, 212, 213, 214, 217, 219, 220; *in* 1873, 331, 332; *in* 1874, 337. 338, 341; *in* 1875, 344; *in* 1876, 350; *in* 1877, 424; his last meeting with Bowles (1877), 433, 446; reminiscences, 405, 433; wrote letter read at Bowles's memorial service, (Jan. 23, 1878), 442, 446.

Dayton, William L., of New Jersey; Republican candidate for Vice-president (1876), **1**: 151.

De Grey, Earl; British commissioner on the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), **2**: 121.

Delano, Columbus, of Ohio; Sec. of the Interior in Pres. Grant's Cabinet, **2**: 170; succeeded by "Zach" Chandler, 225.

Delaware, voted for Seymour (Dem.) for President (1868), **2**: 42.

Deming, Huldah, maiden name of Samuel Bowles's mother: *see* Bowles, Samuel (II.), **1**: 4; a descendant of Miles Standish, 4.

Denniston, Dr., proprietor of a water-cure, Northampton, Mass.; treated Bowles (*in* 1861), **1**: 311, 328.

Denver, Col., visit of Bowles to, to nurse Joseph E. Hood (1871), **1**: 105; *Rocky Mountain News*, 105; Bowles's impressions of (1865), **2**: 3, 4, 5; Bowles's 2d visit, with his daughter and others (1868). 57.

De Trobriand, Philip R., general in U. S. A.; under order of Gov. Kellogg, dispersed Democratic majority of Louisiana Legislature (1874), **2**: 235, 236.

Devens, Gen. Charles, of Massachusetts; nominated for Governor by "People's Convention" (1862), **1**: 358; Attorney-General in President Hayes's Cabinet (1877), **2**: 304.

Dickens, Charles, his pictures of English life, **1**: 364; readings in New York (1868), **2**: 56.

Dickinson, Anna, meeting with Bowles *in* 1869, **2**: 151; *in* 1875, 345.

Dickinson, Austin, of Amherst, Mass.; visits from Bowles, **2**: 79, 150; promoted Bowles's election as trustee of Amherst College (1866), 79.

Dickinson, Daniel S., Democrat, of New York; as Union candidate, elected Attorney-General (1861), **1**: 356.

Dickinson, Edward, Whig, M. C. from Massachusetts; held meeting at which the Republican party was projected, Washington (May 26, 1854), **1**: 117; defeated for reëlection (Nov., 1854), 125, 126; promoted Bowles's election as trustee of Amherst College (1866), **2**: 79.

Dilke, Sir Charles, meetings with Bowles in England (1871), **2**: 174; *in* 1874, 313, 340.

District of Columbia, corruption of its local government under Grant's Administration, **2**: 232.

Dix, John A., of New York; Secretary of War in Buchanan's Cabinet (1860), **1**: 278; Governor of New York (1873–4), **2**: 245; defeated for reëlection by S. J. Tilden (1874), 245.

Dorsey, Stephen W., Republican, Senator from Arkansas; supported Grant's Administration, **2**: 238; desired Congressional repudiation of Arkansas state government, 238.

Dorsheimer, Wm., of New York; delegate to Democratic National Convention (1876), **2**: 261.

Douglas, Stephen A., U. S. Senator from Illinois
ambitious for the Presidency, **1**: 111, 149, 229, 257, 260
sought popularity in the South, **1**: 111, 229, 239, 241, 257, 260, 270
chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories (1853), **1**: 111
in bill for organizing Kansas and Nebraska as territories, declared the prohibition of Slavery north of 36° 30′ (the "Missouri compromise") "inoperative and void" [(1853), **1**: 111, 112, 115, 229
his measure favored by Pres. Pierce's Administration, **1**: 112, 115
—— denounced in the North, **1**: 111–119
—— passed by Congress, **1**: 116
—— caused organization of the Republican party (1853), **1**: 117
his policy of "popular sovereignty," **1**: 114, 115, 229, 239, 240, 257, 260

Douglas, Stephen A.—*Continued.*
his policy opposed by Abraham Lincoln, **1**: 115, 235, 238, 239–242
defeated for Presidential nomination by Buchanan, in Democratic National Convention, Cincinnati (1856), **1**: 149
opposed Congressional sanction of Lecompton constitution, **1**: 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233
courted by Republican leaders, **1**: 229, 232, 234, 241
secured Democratic support in Illinois, despite Buchanan, **1**: 233, 235
opposed for the U. S. senatorship by Abraham Lincoln (1858), **1**: 235, 238
stumped Illinois, holding joint debates with Lincoln, **1**: 115, 239–242
reëlected to the Senate, **1**: 245
deposed from chairmanship of Committee on the Territories, **1**: 245
ostracized by Buchanan's Administration, **1**: 245, 259
made light of the Dred Scott decision (1859), **1**: 257
charged John Brown's Harper's Ferry raid to Republican party (1860), **1**: 270, 271
candidate for Presidential nomination, Democratic National Convention, Charleston (April, 1860), **1**: 259
his platform disgusted Southern delegates, who seceded, **1**: 260, 261
candidate at adjourned convention, Baltimore, and nominated for President, with H. V. Johnson for Vice-president (June, 1860), **1**: 261
declared against Secession, in case of Republican election, **1**: 268
defeated by Abraham Lincoln, **1**: 268
taken, by Ashmun, to pledge Lincoln his support for the Union (April, 1861), **1**: 40
opposed by BOWLES and the *Republican*, **1**: 112–114, 118, 234
supported by BOWLES and the *Republican*, **1**: 228, 229, 233, 242, 262
a demagogue, **1**: 228, 229, 234, 239, 259, 349; **2**: 26
morally untrustworthy, **1**: 234
his stump oratory, **1**: 234
compared to Andrew Johnson and B. F. Butler, **1**: 234, 262.

"Dunn Brown," pseudonym of Rev. Samuel Fiske (*q. v.*), **1**: 347.
Durell, Federal District Judge in Louisiana; ordered establishment of the Kellogg government by U. S. troops (1872), **2**: 224; escaped impeachment by resigning (1874), 224.
Dwight, James S., merchant of Springfield, grandfather of Mrs. BOWLES, **1**: 56.

Eaton, Dorman B., of New York; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), **2**: 254.
Eaton, George, schoolmaster of BOWLES, Springfield, **1**: 16, 18, 56.
Eaton, Wm. F., Democrat, of Hartford, Connecticut candidate for Congress against Hawley (1872), **2**: 199; only Democrat to oppose bill creating the Electoral Commission (1876), 294.
Echo, an American slave-vessel, captured, and her crew acquitted by a Charleston jury, **1**: 247.
Edinburgh, Scotland, BOWLES's visit to (1871), **2**: 174.
Edmunds, George F., U. S. Senator from Vermont; influence with Grant's Administration, **2**: 114, 115, 304; sustained Grant in displacing Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), 130; favored moderation in Louisiana political conflict (1875), 236; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 284; on joint Committee of Conference, 288; author of bill creating an Electoral Commission, 292, 301; made a member of the Commission, 296; voted with the Republican majority ("8 to 7"), 297, 298, 299, 300, 301.
Edwards, Jonathan, **1**: 6.
"Eliot, George," her pictures of English life and scenery, **1**: 365.
Eliot, John, "The Apostle," baptized John Bowles (II.), **1**: 1; the granddaughter of, married to John Bowles (II.), **1**: 1.
Eliot, Thomas D., Whig, M. C. from Massachusetts; held meeting at which the Republican party was projected, Washington (May, 26, 1854), **1**: 117.
Ellis, Charles M., defended Anthony Burns, fugitive remanded to Slavery, Boston (1854), **1**: 119.
Emancipation: *see* NEGROES.
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, of Concord, **1**: 33, 34, 317, 411; **2**: 76, 365, 396; on the execution of John Brown (1859), 255; religious views, **2**: 396; on "overcharge," 458.
Endicott, William C., Judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts; tried libel suit of Willis Phelps against BOWLES (1875), **2**: 315–319; his decision appealed from by both suitors, 317, 318.
England [*see also* GREAT BRITAIN], BOWLES's 1st visit and impressions (1862), **1**: 364–368, 385; 2d visit (1870), **2**: 160; 3d visit (1871), 173, 174; 4th visit (1874), 313.
English, William H., M. C. from Indiana; a Democratic leader in the House (1857), **1**: 230; his measure for admitting Kansas to the Union, 230, 231.
Evarts, William M., of New York; supported Seward for President in Republican National Convention, Chicago

(1860), **1**: 262; counsel for President Johnson in impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 35; rebuked President Grant's military interference in Louisiana politics (1875), 235; counsel for Republicans before Presidential Electoral Commission (1876), 297; Secretary of State in President Hayes's Cabinet, 304, 423, 430; estimate of him by BOWLES, 424.

Everett, Edward, of Massachusetts; delegate to Whig National Convention (1852), **1**: 93; conservative as to Slavery, 131, 258; "Constitutional Union" candidate for President (1860), 246, 268.

Fenton, Reuben E., U. S. Senator from New York (1869–75); opposed by the Grant Administration and by Senator Conkling, **2**: 132; acted with the Reformers, 176; supported by Horace Greeley, 183, 192; sought nomination of David Davis for President by Reform party (1872), 185; contributed to Greeley's nomination, 192, 212; estimate of him by BOWLES, 424.

"Fern, Fanny," pseudonym of Mrs. James Parton *(q. v.)*

Ferry, O. S., U. S. Senator from Connecticut; elected Senator, over Hawley, by combination of Independent Republicans and Democrats (1872), **2**: 213, *n.*

Fessenden, William P., U. S. Senator from Maine; opposed extension of Slavery (1854), **1**: 116; voted to acquit President Johnson, impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 37.

Field, David Dudley, of New York; counsel for Fisk and Gould and the Erie Railway, **2**: 97; attacked by the *Republican* for supporting the Erie Ring (1871), 97–101, 167, 168; responded, in a series of letters, to the *Republican's* attack, 98; counsel for the Democrats before Presidential Electoral Commission (1876), 297; presumed cause of his reputation in England and at home, 421.

Field, Dudley (son of David Dudley Field), of New York; controversy with the *Republican* about services to the Erie Ring (1871), **2**: 97–101.

Field, Kate; writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389; meeting with BOWLES in New York (1875), **2**: 345.

Field, Stephen J., Justice U. S. Supreme Court, Democrat, **1**: 292; member of the Electoral Commission (1876), 292, 294, 296, 300.

Fillmore, Millard, of Buffalo, N. Y.; President of the United States (1850–3); was Vice-president, and became President by death of Taylor, July 9, 1850, **1**: 79; defeated for Whig Presidential nomination by Scott (1852), 94; candidate of the American party for President (1856), 149, 154, 155; defeated by Buchanan, Dem., 160.

Fish, Hamilton, of New York; Secretary of State in Grant's Cabinet (1868), **2**: 113, 252; promoted arbitration with England (1871), 120; American commissioner in the Anglo-American joint commission, 121; recalled Motley from the English mission (1871), 129; antagonism to Senator Sumner (1871), 130; favored moderation in Louisiana political conflict (1875), 236.

Fisher, Warren, of Boston, Mass.; his transactions in railroad securities with J. G. Blaine, **2**: 257.

Fisk & Hatch, bankers, New York; suspended, after failure of Jay Cooke & Co. (1873), **2**: 233.

Fisk, James, Jr., of New York, **2**: 93–101; his stock gambling, 93, 104; his control of the Erie Railway (1868), 93; his control of New York courts, lawyers, etc. (1868), 94; sued the *Republican* and other journals for libel (1868), 94; secured BOWLES's imprisonment, 95; his course defended by David Dudley Field, etc., 97–101; his "Black Friday" speculations (1869), 104.

Fiske, Rev. Samuel, of Massachusetts; his ("Dunn Brown's") war-letters to the *Republican*, **1**: 347.

Florida, joined the Southern Confederacy (1861), **1**: 274
voted for Grant for President (1868), **2**: 43
vote for President disputed, the Returning Board for Hayes, Supreme Court for fraud and intimidation of voters claimed, **2**: 286 [Tilden (1876), **2**: 283, 285, 296
Democratic Governor-elect given his office, **2**: 288
visits from political agents, **2**: 290
attempt to bribe a Republican elector to vote for Tilden, **2**: 290
vote examined by Electoral Commission; given to Hayes, **2**: 296, 297.

Floyd, John B., of Virginia; in Pres. Buchanan's Cabinet (1857–60), **1**: 224.

Forbes, John M., of Milton, Mass.; opposed the Hartford and Erie R. R. job (1869), **2**: 105; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), 274.

Forney, John W., of Pennsylvania; influence with Pres. Buchanan, **1**: 227; counseled moderate measures in Kansas (1857), 227; influence in Penn., 228.

Foster, Charles, Republican, M. C. from Ohio; on committee to visit Louisiana and investigate political troubles (1875), **2**: 236; reported in condemnation of Gov. Kellogg's government, 236, 287; supported bill creating the Electoral Commission (1876), 294.

Foster, W. E., M. P., favored amicable arbitration of the *Alabama* claims (1863), **2**: 119.
Fowler, Joseph S., U. S. Senator; voted to acquit President Johnson, impeachment trial. (1868), **2**: 37.
Fowler, W. A., of Massachusetts; Fusion candidate for Congress (1856), **1**: 156.
France, war with Germany (1870), **2**: 160, 164; BOWLES's 4th visit to (1874), 313.
Franklin, Benjamin, left Boston for Philadelphia, **1**: 6; appreciation of the theater, **2**: 77; literary gift, 182.
Fredericksburg, Va., battle of, **1**: 343.
Frelinghuysen, Frederick T., Republican, U. S. Senator from New Jersey; on joint Committee of Conference on Presidential Election (1876), **2**: 288; member of the Electoral Commission, 296; expected to act impartially, 301; voted with the Republican majority ("8 to 7"), 297, 298, 299, 300, 301.
Fremont, John Charles, of California; political inexperience, **1**: 151; personal character, 151, 360; **2**: 111; nominated for President by First National Convention of the Republican party, Philadelphia (1856), 150; Secession threatened, in the event of his election, 154, 155; lost votes through the American party (Know-nothings), 155, 159; defeated by Buchanan, 160; supported by the *Republican*, 172; as commander in Missouri, proclaimed freedom of slaves belonging to rebels (1862), 352; his proclamation disavowed by Lincoln's government, 352, 353; dropped out of the service, 360; nominated by a Radical convention as Presidential candidate against Lincoln (1864), 360; received no support, 360.
Frost, Gen. G. W., of Omaha, Neb.; assisted sale of BOWLES's *Across the Continent*, etc., **2**: 146.
Frothingham, Rev. O. B., of New York; his sermons, **1**: 336, 409, 411; **2**: 48, 151; at the Unitarian Conference, Brooklyn (1866), **2**: 48, 49; his *Religion of Humanity*, 380.
Frye, William P., Republican, M. C. from Maine, on committee to investigate Louisiana political troubles (1875), **2**: 236; reported, condemning Returning Board, but favoring Kellogg's government, 237.

Gales (Gales & Seaton), editor of the *National Intelligencer*, Washington, **1**: 26.
Galloway, Samuel, of Ohio; favored Judge McLean for Presidency (*in* 1856), **1**: 172.
Gardner, Henry J., elected Governor of Massachusetts by the Know-nothings (1854), **1**: 125; refused to remove Judge Loring for remanding a fugitive slave (1855), 134; vetoed a Personal Liberty bill passed by the Legislature in nullification of the Fugitive Slave Law (1855), 134, 135; his veto overridden by the Legislature (1855), 135; ambiguous political position, 142, 143, 144, 146, 155, 169; defeated by Rockwell for Republican nomination for Governor (1855), 143; nominated by the American party, and elected Governor (1855), 144; renominated by the American party, and elected Governor (1856), 155, 160, 173, 175, 291; sought reëlection as Governor (1857), 185, 187; defeated by N. P. Banks, 243.
Garfield, Gen. James A., M. C. from Ohio; charged with implication in the Credit Mobilier bribery (1872), **2**: 228; praised by the N. Y. *Nation* (1874), 337; Republican leader of the House (1874), 232; opposed the Force Bill (1875), 238, 239; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 284; reported in vindication of the Returning Board, 287; opposed creation of the Electoral Commission, 294, 295; made a member of the Commission, 295, 296; voted with the Republican majority ("8 to 7"), 297, 298, 299, 300.
Garrison, William Lloyd, leader of the Abolition party, **1**: 46, 49, 74, 190; **2**: 455; separated from Birney and the "Liberty party" in opposing anti-Slavery political action (1840), **1**: 46, 49; refused to vote, 49; denounced the Union, as recognizing Slavery (1844), 49, 74, 87; declared the Constitution "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," 49; attacked the churches for complicity with Slavery, 49; repudiated obedience to the laws, 85; repudiated the Missouri Compromise, 87; repudiated war, 190; promoted Abolitionist meetings, 88; offended moderate people, 111; discountenanced by the *Republican*, 49, 50, 85, 88; was resisted by later school of Radicals (1864), 413; non-conception of Secession and Emancipation, 197.
Gaston, William, of Boston, Massachusetts; Democratic nominee for Governor (1874), **2**: 265, 266; supported by the liquor interest and by reformers, 266, 271, 274; elected over Washburne, 272, 344; renominated for Governor (1875); defeated by Rice, 273, 274; declined nomination in favor of C. F. Adams (1876), 275.
Geary, John W., of Pennsylvania; appointed by President Pierce Democratic Governor of Kansas (1856), **1**: 153, 224; resigned (1857), 224.
Geneva, N. Y.; home of Mary S. D. Schermerhorn, afterward Mrs. SAMUEL BOWLES, **1**: 56; visits of BOWLES and his family to, *in* 1867, **2**: 55; *in* 1877, 417.
Geneva, Switzerland; international tribunal to determine claims of United States against Great Britain for damages by Confederate cruisers, awarding $15,500,000 to the United States (1871, '72), **2**: 120–123, 180, 230.

Georgia, her declaration of Secession, **1**: 270
joined the Southern Confederacy (1861), **1**: 274
voted for Seymour (Dem.) for President (1868), **2**: 43
representatives admitted to Congress (1870), **2**: 115
voted for Greeley (Dem.) for President (1872), **2**: 200.

Germantown, Penn., "Relief Society" of, **2**: 325.
Germany, Bowles's 1st visit and impressions (1862), **1**: 368–370; Emperor of, arbitrated between Great Britain and the United States in the matter of the North-western boundary (1871), **2**: 121; Miss S. A. Bowles and Miss Whitney studied and traveled in (1869–71), 148, 155, 160; Bowles traveled in, with his daughter and a party (1870), 160; war of, with France (1870), 160, 164.
Gettysburg, Penn.; battle of, checking Lee's invasion of the North, **1**: 343, 363; Lincoln's address at, 238.
Giddings, Joshua R., of Ohio; attended National Free-soil Convention, Buffalo (1848), **1**: 52; spoke in support of Van Buren at Springfield, 53.
Gillett, Edward B., of Westfield, Mass., **1**: 67; horseback trip with Bowles (1861), 320, 321; promoted Bowles's election as trustee of Amherst College (1866), **2**: 79; named by the *Republican* for Republican nomination for Congress (1873), 268.
Gilmer, John A., of North Carolina; offered position in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), **1**: 282.
Gladden, Rev. Washington, of Springfield; writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389; aided in establishing the "Union Relief Association" (1877), **2**: 326; officiated at Bowles's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441.
Gladstone, Wm. E.; favored amicable arbitration of the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1868), **2**: 119; renewed negotiations and carried out the treaty (1871), 120–122.
Godkin, Edwin L., of New York, editor of the *Nation*, **2**: 56, 163, 168; independence in journalism, 133; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; his hypercriticism, 337, 338.
Goethe, New York tribute to (1875), **2**: 393.
Goodrich, John Z., of Massachusetts; a Whig leader (1855), **1**: 170.
Gordon, Gen. Geo. H., of Massachusetts; charged B. F. Butler with complicity in supplying Lee's army, **2**: 92; took the stump against Butler for Congress (1876), 275.

Grant, Gen. Ulysses S., of Illinois, President of the United States (1869–77)
succeeded in suppressing Confederate forces in the West, **1**: 343; **2**: 112
commanded in Virginia and overcame Gen. Lee, **1**: 343, 414; **2**: 38
magnanimous treatment of the Confederates, **2**: 111, 195
ordered by Pres. Johnson to act as Secretary of War, *vice* E. M. Stanton, suspended [(1867), **2**: 33
nominated for President by National Republican Convention, Chicago (1868); elected, [**2**: 38, 39, 42
his first Administration (1868–72), **2**: 110–138, 175–200
his Cabinet, **2**: 113, 143, 243, 253

See Belknap, Gen.,
Borie, A. E.,
Boutwell, Geo.,
Bristow, B. F.,
Chandler, "Zach,"
Cox, J. D.,
Cresswell, A. J.,
Delano, C.
Fish, Hamilton,
Hoar, E. R.,
Jewell, M.,
Morrill, L. M.,
Pierrepont, E.,
Robeson, G. M.,
Stewart, A. T.,
Washburn, E. B.,
Williams, Geo. R.

extravagant appropriations asked for the Departments (1870), **2**: 117, 118
Treaty of Washington (1871), **2**: 119–123, 230
scheme for annexing San Domingo (1871), **2**: 127, 130
his reduced support in Congress (1871), **2**: 129, 130
his renomination opposed by the Reform element among Republicans (1871), **2**: 134, 176
—— by discomfited politicians, **2**: 176
—— by Liberal Republicans (1872), **2**: 177–187, 228
his renomination favored by the conservative capitalist class, **2**: 177, 190, 195, 196, 199
—— by Massachusetts Republican Convention, **2**: 179
renominated by the National Republican Convention, Philadelphia, June, 1872; his second Administration (1873–1877), **2**: 222–263 [elected, **2**: 189, 199, 200, 210
—— supported by some who had disapproved his reëlection, **2**: 223
—— extraordinary nominations to office, **2**: 231
proposed for a third term in the Presidency, **2**: 237, 238, 250, 599
partisan use of official patronage, **2**: 88, 116, 117, 132–137, 254, 255, 256
his popularity after the war, **2**: 38, 42, 55, 111

Grant, Gen. Ulysses S.—*Continued.*
popular sayings: "Let us have peace!" **2**: 42, 116
inexperienced in civil administration, **2**: 111, 112, 114
ignorant of politics and of governmental methods, **2**: 111, 112, 113, 175, 198
—— of finance, **2**: 230
fixedness of purpose, **2**: 112, 239, 240
honesty of intention, **2**: 112, 175
basis of his lasting fame, **2**: 111.
Graves, Mrs. Mary Hinman, friend of Mrs. S. Bowles (II.), died (1856), **1**: 172.
Great Britain [*see also* ENGLAND], treaty with, for suppressing the slave-trade, disregarded by the Buchanan Administration, **1**: 246
conceded exemption from search to American shipping, **1**: 247
danger of war with, from the seizure of Mason and Slidell, Confederate commissioners (1861), **1**: 332
—— from equipment of Confederate cruisers in British ports, etc., **2**: 119
concluded the Treaty of Washington with the United States, settling all outstanding differences (1871), **2**: 119–123.
Greeley, Horace, of New York; a teacher of men and reformer, **1**: 28, 29, 191; **2**: 181, 182, 188, 210, 449
his style in writing, **1**: 29; **2**: 181, 182
his political independence, **1**: 29, 67
his political sagacity, **1**: 191; **2**: 194, 198
personal gullibility, **2**: 182, 183, 187, 192, 193
taste for hobbies, **2**: 182, 188, 193, 210
benevolence, **2**: 182, 216
general fame, **2**: 181, 184, 186, 188
uncertain temper, **2**: 182, 193
appearance and manners, **2**: 181, 182, 186, 193
argued for high protective tariff, **2**: 183, 187
established the New York *Tribune* (1841), **1**: 28, 29
an anti-Slavery Whig (1848), **1**: 52
opposed extension of slavery, **1**: 52
discountenanced the Free-soil party and Van Buren (1848), **1**: 52
supported Gen. Taylor, Whig candidate for President, **1**: 54
supported Fremont for Republican Presidential candidate (1856), **1**: 172
favored reëlection of S. A. Douglas to the Senate (1857), **1**: 229
opposed nomination of Seward for President, Chicago (1860), **1**: 262
favored magnanimous treatment of the South after the war, **2**: 45, 124, 183, 186, 190, 194, 232
signed Jeff. Davis's bail-bond, **2**: 183
hostility to the Grant Administration, **2**: 183, 190
suggested as Liberal Republican nominee for Vice-president (1872), **2**: 178
—— by the *Republican* for President, **2**: 180
nominated for President over C. F. Adams, Trumbull, etc., **2**: 185–189, 210
not supported by originators of the Reform movement, **2**: 187, 188, 191
supported by the *Republican* and BOWLES, **2**: 187, 192, 211, 213, 216, 397
nominated by the Democratic National Convention, Baltimore, **2**: 190, 210, 211
assailed by Republican organs, **2**: 189, 192, 193, 197
distrusted by Northern Democrats, **2**: 191
his speeches during the campaign, **2**: 194, 200
defeated, **2**: 199
died, **2**: 200.

Greene, Col., politician and editor in Washington, **1**: 26.
Grey's Peak, Col.; BOWLES's impressions of, **2**: 84.
Griffin, Solomon B., associate editor of the *Republican* (1872), **2**: 308.
Grimes, James W., U. S. Senator from Iowa; voted to acquit President Johnson, impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 37.
Gould, Jay, of New York, **2**: 93–101; his stock-gambling, 93; his control of the Erie Railway (1868), 93; his control of New York courts, lawyers, etc., 94; defended by David Dudley Field, etc., 97–101; his "Black Friday" speculations (1869), 104; antagonism to Secretary of the Treasury Bristow, 253.
Groesbeck, ——, of Ohio; counsel for President Johnson in impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 35.
Grover, Lafayette F., Democrat, Gov. of Oregon; illegally named Cronin a Presidential elector (1876), **2**: 291; his appointment set aside by the Electoral Commission, 299, 300.
Guthrie, James, of Kentucky; offered position in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), **1**: 282.

Haldeman, publisher of the *Courier Journal*, Louisville, Ky., **2**: 134, 419.
Hale, Charles, Editor of the Boston *Advertiser*, **1**: 292.
Hale, Eugene, Republican, M. C. from Maine; opposed the Force Bill, (1875), **2**: 239; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 287; opposed creation of the Electoral Commission, 294.
Hale, John P., of Massachusetts; supported the Free-soil party, **1**: 90; Free-soil candidate for President (1852), 95.
Hall, A. Oakey, Mayor of New York; member of the Tweed Ring, **2**: 95, 246.
Hallett, Benj. F., Democratic leader in Massachusetts; disposed to support war measures of the government (1861), **1**: 355, 356.
Halstead, Murat, Editor of the Cincinnati *Commercial* · independence in journalism, **2**: 133, 348; editorial capacity, 154; attended Liberal Republican National Convention, Cincinnati (1872), 184; attacked Democratic doctrine of inconvertible paper currency (1875), 244; meeting with BOWLES in Paris (1874), 313, 340; trip with BOWLES in Virginia, etc. (1877), 416, 417; his "Dollar of the daddies" theories (1877), 418, 419; spoke at BOWLES'S memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441, 443; letters from BOWLES (1875), 348; *(in* 1876), 349; *(in* 1877), 418, 419, 426.
Hamburg, S. C., massacre of negro militia by Democratic mob, during Presidential campaign (1876), **2**: 279, 282.
Hamlin, Hannibal, of Maine; Republican candidate for Vice-president (1860); elected, **1**: 264.
Hammond, James H., U. S. Senator from South Carolina; resigned senatorship when South Carolina seceded (1860), **1**: 273.
Hampton, Wade, Gen., of South Carolina, **2**: 279; Democratic candidate for Governor (1876), 279; negro voters intimidated by his partisans, protected by U. S. troops, 279, 282, 289; disputed governorship with Chamberlain, 289, recognized by seceding Democratic legislators, 289; by Pres. Hayes (1877), 302, 305.
Harding, Rev. John, of Longmeadow, Mass.; member of "The Club," Springfield, **2**: 76.
Hardy, Alpheus, of Boston, Mass., opposed the Hartford & Erie R. R. job (1869), **2**: 105.
Harper's Ferry, Va., the U. S. Arsenal at, attacked by John Brown *(q. v.)*, (1859), **1**: 219, 247–255.
Harper's *Monthly*, New York, **1**: 330.
Harper's *Weekly*, New York; editorial articles by G. W. Curtis, decorously opposing Greeley's election as President (1872), **2**: 197; scurrilous caricatures of Greeley by Nast, 197; censured by the *Republican* for ignoring Republican corruption and belittling Gov. Tilden's reforms (1875), 247.
Harris, Daniel L., of Springfield, Mass.; bolted the Republican ticket, and supported for the Legislature by the *Republican* (1863), **1**: 359, 403; member of "The Club," Springfield, **2**: 76.
Harris, F. H., of Springfield; friend of BOWLES from boyhood, **1**: 16.
Harrison, William Henry (1773–1841), of Indiana; President of the United States (1841) for one month.
Harte, Bret, writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389; his poems, **2**: 166; meetings with BOWLES, 170.
Hartford, Conn., Samuel Bowles I. kept a grocery store in, **1**: 2; Samuel Bowles II. worked as a printer in, 3; early had railroad connections, 21; its pioneer daily newspaper, 21; visit of Bowles to (1870), **2**: 165.
Hartford *Courant*, favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), **2**: 253; defended Roscoe Conkling against the *Republican* (1877), 423; its obituary of BOWLES (1878), 449.
Hartranft, John F., Republican, Governor of Pennsylvania; candidate for Presidential nomination, Cincinnati Convention (1876), **2**: 259.
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; John Bowles II. graduated from (1671), **1**: 1; John Bowles III. (1703), 2.
Haskell, E. B., editor of the Boston *Herald*, **2**: 337, 424, 432; introduced by BOWLES to Senator Dawes, Washington (1874), 337; introduced by BOWLES to G. W. Smalley, London (1877), 424.
Haughton, Richard, editor of the primitive period, **1**: 26.
Hawley, Alanson, assistant editor of the *Republican*, **1**: 104.
Hawley, Gen. Joseph R., of Hartford, Conn.; attacked B. F. Butler's financial heresies (1868), **2**: 92; meetings with SAMUEL BOWLES *in* 1870, **2**: 166; *in* 1875, 345; opposed by the *Republican* for reëlection to Congress against Eaton (1872), 199; defeated by Ferry for the U. S. senatorship (1872), 213, *n.*; opposed the Force Bill (1875), 238, 239; opposed Sherman's Resumption Bill (1874), 242; attacked the *Republican* in defense of Roscoe Conkling (1877), 423; spoke at BOWLES' memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441, 444.
Hayes, Rutherford B., of Ohio, President of the United States (1877–81) elected Governor, over William Allen, on the issue of resumption of specie payment [(1875), **2**: 244, 245

Hayes, Rutherford B.—*Continued.*
nominated for President by Republican Nat. Con., Cincinnati (1876), **2**: 259, 260, 261,
his letter of acceptance, promising Civil Service Reform, **2**: 260, 262, 278, 281, 418, 422
his views on reform ignored in the canvass by the party leaders, **2**: 278, 280, 281, 420,
supported by the *Republican*, **2**: 281, 353, 424 [421, 424
his election in doubt, **2**: 282–303
disputed election in Florida, **2**: 283–286, 290–300
—— in Louisiana, **2**: 283, 288–300
—— in South Carolina, **2**: 283–286, 290–300
—— in Oregon, **2**: 283, 290–292
—— referred to an Electoral Commission, **2**: 292–300, 356
—— contest in Congress, **2**: 284, 293–303, 447
made President, **2**: 303
his Cabinet, **2**: 304, 355
his treatment of the Southern states, **2**: 305, 416, 428–430
his reform measures, **2**: 306, 416, 430
his Administration supported by the *Republican* (1877), **2**: 426, 428, 430
letter from BOWLES (1877), **2**: 421.

Hayti, Republic of, objected to annexation of San Domingo to the United States (1870), **2**: 128; intimidated by war-vessels sent by President Grant, 128; championed by Senator Sumner, 128.

Helper, Hinton R., his anti-Slavery book, "The Impending Crisis" (1859), **1**: 256.

Henderson, John B., U. S. Senator from Missouri; voted to acquit President Johnson, impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 37; counsel for the government against the Whisky Ring frauds; discharged by President Grant (1875), 251.

Hendricks, Thomas A., Democrat, U. S. Senator from Indiana; candidate for Presidential nomination (1876), **2**: 260; nominated for Vice-president, 261; advocate of currency inflation, 261.

Herndon, William H., of Illinois; law partner of Abraham Lincoln, **1**: 236; supported Lincoln as to "house-divided-against-itself" speech, 239.

Hewitt, Abram S., Democrat, M. C. from New York; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), **2**: 288; advocated creation of an Electoral Commission, 294.

Higginson, T. W., of Cambridge, Massachusetts; attempted rescue of Burns, fugitive slave, in Boston (1854), **1**: 119; promoted John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry (1859), 250; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), **2**: 254.

Hill, Benjamin H., M. C. from Georgia; parliamentary conflict with J. G. Blaine (1875), **2**: 250.

Hoar, Ebenezer Rockwood, of Concord, Mass.; appointed judge by Gov. Banks, (1859), **1**: 297; his judicial ability, 297; a friend of Pres. Grant's, **2**: 114, 266; opposed Gen. Butler's nomination for Governor, in Republican State Convention, Worcester (1871), 108; Attorney-General in Grant's Cabinet, 113; appointed a U. S. Commissioner on the international arbitration (1871), 121; candidate for U. S. Senator, on death of Sumner (1873), 266; defeated by Governor Washburn, 267; again candidate for Senator against Dawes (1874), defeated, 273; opposed the Force Bill (1875), 239; opposed Sherman's Resumption Bill (1875), 242; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), **2**: 274; Independent candidate for Congress against Gen. Butler (1876), defeated, 275, 277.

Hoar, George Frisbie, Republican, M. C., of Worcester, Mass.; presided at Massachusetts Republican Convention, Worcester (1871); opposed Gen. Butler's nomination for Governor, **2**: 108; on committee to investigate Louisiana political troubles (1875), 236; reported, condemning Returning Board, but favoring Kellogg's government, 237; opposed the Force Bill (1875), 239; opposed Sherman's Resumption Bill (1875), 242; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), 275; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), 288; advocated creation of an Electoral Commission, 294, 295; vouched for the non-partisanship of the Supreme Court judges, 295, 301; made a member of the Commission, 296; voted with the Republican majority ("8 to 7"), 297, 298, 299, 300, 301; elected U. S. Senator, over Boutwell (1877), 277, 356; supported Pres. Hayes's Administration, 430.

Hoar, Samuel, supported the National Free-soil Convention, at Buffalo (1848), **1**: 52; on committee to organize a new party to oppose Slavery extension (1855), 140.

Holland, Dr. Josiah Gilbert, became associate editor of the *Republican* (1850), **1**: 58, 61, 102; purchased one-quarter interest, 58; personal relations with BOWLES, 63, 65; **2**: 69, 170, 444; office work, **1**: 103; managed the *Republican*

during BOWLES's editorship of the Boston *Traveller* (1857), 182, 187, 295; sold his interest, but remained a contributor (1857), 187, 202, 295, 313, 315, 387; his criticisms on Dr. Huntington's claims for the Episcopal church (1861), **2**: 398; managed the *Republican* during BOWLES's trip to Europe (1862), **1**: 315, 357; opposed radicalism in the Republican party (1862), 357; editor of *Scribner's Monthly* (later *The Century Magazine*), N. Y., 202; consideration shown him by the *Republican*, **2**: 69; a member of "The Club," Springfield, 76; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; literary taste, culture, and style, **1**: 61, 62, 200, 388; as a moralist and essayist, 61, 63, 64, 71, 187, 200, 201; **2**: 382; orthodox in theology, but liberal, **1**: 62; **2**: 382, 396, 398; conservative as to New England "issues," **1**: 62; his "History of Western Mass.," 100; his novel, "The Bay Path," 100; his "Timothy Titcomb's Letters to Young People," 201, 387; his "Letters to the Joneses" (1864), 387; delivered lectures, 188, 202, 295, 313; spoke at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), **2**: 441, 444, *also* **1**: 65; his work reviewed at his death, 200.

Holmes, Dr. Oliver Wendell, his war poems, **1**: 345.

Holt, Jacob, of Kentucky; Postmaster-General in Buchanan's Cabinet (1860), **1**: 278.

Hood, Joseph E. (1815–71), assistant editor of the *Republican* (1855–69), **1**: 104–109, 182, 187, 199, 304, 332, 387, 388, 395, 409; **2**: 382; removed to Colorado for his health (1869), **1**: 108; **2**: 68; death (1871), 108; his thought and style, **2**: 382, 396.

Hooker, Gen. Joseph, U. S. A.; meeting with BOWLES, Washington (1871), **2**: 169.

Hooker, John, of Hartford, Conn.; visited BOWLES at Springfield (1874), **2**: 342.

Hooker, Mrs. Isabella Beecher, of Hartford, Conn.; letter from BOWLES (1877), **2**: 423.

Hooker, Mrs. Thomas, *née* Sarah Augusta Bowles *(q. v.)*, oldest child of SAMUEL BOWLES; married, at her father's house, Springfield (June, 1874), **2**: 329, 330, 340; traveled, with her husband, in Europe (1874), 330, 339, 340, 344; joined in London by her father (1874), 313, 330, 339; absent during her father's last illness, 435; his farewell to her, 435; letters from her father (1874), from Paris, 339; from England, 340; from Springfield, 342; *in* 1874, from Vermont, 345 *(see also under* BOWLES, SARAH A.)

Hooker, Thomas, of New Haven, Conn.; married Sarah Augusta, eldest daughter of SAMUEL BOWLES (1874), **2**: 329, 330; traveled, with his wife, in Europe (1874), 313, 330, 339, 340; joined, abroad, by BOWLES (1874), 330, 339; returned, with wife and daughter, to Springfield (1876), 330, 351, 352; his health, 351; traveled for his health in the West with his wife, 330; recalled by illness of the child, 330; letters from BOWLES (1874), 339, 340.

Hopkins, Erastus, of Northampton, Massachusetts; opposed H. J. Gardner for Governor (1856), **1**: 174.

Hopkins, Mark, of Williamstown, Massachusetts; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), **2**: 254.

Howe, Dr. Samuel G., of Boston; attempted rescue of Burns, fugitive slave, in Boston (1854), **1**: 119; promoted John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry (1859), 250; proposed for minister to Greece (1869), **2**: 141.

Howe, Timothy O., U. S. Senator; sustained President Grant in displacing Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), **2**: 130.

Hubbard, Richard D., Democratic candidate for Governor of Connecticut (1876); elected, **2**: 281; sent letter to BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 442.

Hudson, Frederic, an editor of the N. Y. *Herald*, **1**: 29.

Hunter, Gen. David, as commander in South Carolina, proclaimed freedom to slaves of rebels; his order canceled by Pres. Lincoln (1862), **1**: 352.

Huntington, ——, of the N. Y. *Tribune*; meetings with BOWLES in England and Paris (1874), **2**: 313, 339, 340, 341.

Huntington, Frederick D., D. D., of Boston; left Unitarianism for Episcopacy (1861), **2**: 597; controversy in the *Church Monthly* with the *Republican* (1861), 397; letter to BOWLES (1861), 397; BOWLES's reply, 398–401.

Hunton, Eppa, Democrat, M. C. from Virginia; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), **2**: 288; member of the Electoral Commission, 296.

Illinois, elections carried by the Democrats (1855), **1**: 144
voted for Fremont (Amer.) for President (1856), **1**: 160
did residence there emancipate a slave? [*see* SCOTT, DRED], **1**: 220
reëlection of S. A. Douglas to the U. S. Senate opposed by Lincoln [*see* DOUGLAS, state election Democratic (1862), **1**: 356 [*also* LINCOLN] (1858), **1**: 232–245
Presidential election Republican, reëlecting Lincoln (1864), **1**: 362
Legislature elected Judge David Davis (Independent), to the U. S. Senate, thereby causing a Republican partisan vote ("8 to 7"), the Electoral Commission to de- [termine the disputed Hayes-Tilden Presidential election (1876), **2**: 295.

Independent journals: *see* JOURNALISM.
Indiana, elections carried by the Democrats (1855), **1**: 144
decisive vote for Buchanan (Dem.) for President (1856), **1**: 154, 160
its Democratic vote charged to lack of popular education, **1**: 161
elections for the Republicans (1858), **1**: 244
—— Democrats (1862), **1**: 356
its vote doubtful in Presidential campaign (1876), **2**: 281
voted for Tilden (Dem.), **2**: 283.

Indians, North American; dangerous to Western settlers and travelers, **2**: 57, 83.
Ingersoll, Col. Robt. G., of Illinois; nominated Blaine for Presidential candidate in National Convention, Cincinnati (1876), **2**: 259.
Italy, BOWLES's impressions of (1862), **1**: 376; King of, arbitrated between Great Britain and the United States in the matter of the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), **2**: 121.

Jackson, Andrew, of Kentucky; President of the United States (1829–37); his treatment of nullification, **1**: 278; his partisan civil-service system, **2**: 116.
Jenckes, Thomas A., M. C. from Rhode Island; pioneer of civil-service reform in Congress, **2**: 117.
Jewell, Marshall, of Connecticut; Postmaster-general in Pres. Grant's Cabinet (1875), **2**: 243; favored moderation in Louisiana political conflict (1875), 236; reforms in the Post-office department, 243; meeting with BOWLES in Washington (1875), 345; forced to resign his seat in the Cabinet (1876), 280.

Johnson, Andrew (1808–75), of Tennessee, President of the United States (1865–9); a representative "poor white," **2**: 21, 25, 26 [Southern loyalist, **1**: 360
nominated for Vice-president, with Lincoln for President; elected (1864), **1**: 360
became President on Lincoln's death (1865), **2**: 16
lacked qualities for high political position, **2**: 16, 26
his policy of immediately rehabilitating the Southern states, **2**: 18, 20, 23
in conflict with Republican leaders in Congress, **2**: 20, 21, 22, 24, 33
vetoed the Freedmen's Bureau Bill; passed by Congress over his veto (1866), **2**: 21, 22
denounced his opponents in public speeches, **2**: 22, 25, 26, 35, 38
vetoed the Civil Rights Bill, **2**: 23
his vetoes systematically overridden, **2**: 24, 28
attempt to create a "Conservative party" in his support, **2**: 24, 25
his power of removal checked by the Tenure of Office law, **2**: 33
attempted to remove Secretary of War Stanton, **2**: 33–35, 37
impeached by the House; tried before the Senate; acquitted (Feb. 21–May 26, 1868), [**2**: 35–38, 56, 92
censured by vote of National Republican Convention, Chicago (1868), **2**: 39
supported by BOWLES and the *Republican*, **2**: 20, 21, 22, 25, 33, 38, 54
opposed by the *Republican*, **2**: 24, 26, 33, 35, 36
his Cabinet, **2**: 22, 33, 34.

Johnson, Herschel V., of Georgia; Democratic candidate for Vice-president (1859), **1**: 261.
Johnson, Reverdy, of Maryland, Conservative Democrat; minister to England (1868), **2**: 120; negotiated arbitration treaty with British government (1869), 120; treaty rejected by U. S. Senate, 120.
Johnston, Stoddard, of Kentucky, **2**: 419.

Kansas, organized as a territory out of the Missouri territory (1854), **1**: 110–16
struggle as to the establishment of Slavery in, **1**: 110–117, 126–131, 137, 152–159, [249
populated by anti-Slavery settlers from the North, **1**: 128, 136, 242, 229
A training-school for John Brown, **1**: 249
pro-Slavery faction supported by Pres. Pierce's Administration, **1**: 130, 131, 141, [146, 148, 152, 153, 224
visited by Congressional investigating committee (1856), **1**: 146
pro-Slavery policy of Pres. Buchanan's Administration (1857–61), **1**: 219, 224–231
—— disgusted Northern Democrats [*see* S. A. DOUGLAS], **1**: 219
governed by Geary, of Pennsylvania, **1**: 224
— Walker, of Mississippi, **1**: 224–227
— rival Legislatures, the Topeka (Free State), **1**: 225
—— —— Lecompton, (pro-Slavery), **1**: 225, 226
the proposed Lecompton Constitution; defeated, **1**: 226–231
admission assured by the election of 1858, **1**: 244
new constitution framed at Wyandotte; ratified (1860), **1**: 231
admitted as the most anti-Slavery state in the Union (1861), **1**: 231
Republican majority reduced, in state election (1874), **2**: 233

Kasson, John A., Republican, M. C., opposed the Force Bill (1875), **2**: 239; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 284; counsel for the Republicans before the Electoral Commission, 297.
Kearsarge, U. S. war-vessel, sunk Confederate cruiser *Alabama*, **2**: 119.
Kelley, William D., Republican, M. C. from Pennsylvania; took the stump for Hayes (1876), **2**: 281; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote, 284; reported in vindication of the Returning Board, 287.
Kellogg, William Pitt, of Louisiana; declared by Republicans to be elected Governor over McEnery (1872), **2**: 224; supported by President Grant's Administration, 224; supported by U. S. Judge Durell, 224; established in office by U. S. troops, 224; displaced by McEnery (1874), 233; reinstated by U. S. troops, 233, 234, 235; misrule, 234; ejected Democratic members from the House (1875), 235; assured of support by Grant's Secretary of War, Belknap, 235; his usurpation denounced by public meetings in the North, 235; question referred to Congress by President Grant, 236; question investigated by congressional committee, 236, 237; retained in office (Feb., 1872), 237.

Kentucky, anti-Slavery men expelled from (1859), **1**: 258
voted for Bell for President (1860), **1**: 268
her doubtful attitude as to Secession (1861), **1**: 280; **2**: 134
offered a place in Lincoln's Cabinet, **1**: 282
voted for Seymour (Dem.) for President (1868), **2**: 42
efforts to stimulate reform and progress after the War [*see also* Louisville *Courier Journal*, **2**: 134, 135, 419
voted for Greeley (Dem.) for President (1872), **2**: 200
BOWLES traveled in, with Halstead and Watterson, (1877), **2**: 416, 417, 418, 419

Kerr, Michael C., Democrat, M. C. from Indiana; Speaker of the House (1875), **2**: 249; died, 249.
Key, David M., Democrat, of Tennessee; general in the Confederate army, **2**: 304; Postmaster-general in President Hayes's Cabinet (1877), 304, 424.
King, Edward, writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389.
King, John L., member of "The Club," Springfield, **2**: 76, 167.
King, Mrs. William H., *née* Mary Bowles *(q. v.)*, 3d child of SAMUEL BOWLES; married at her father's house, Springfield (April, 1875), **2**: 329, 330.
King, William H., of Springfield; married Mary, 2d daughter of SAMUEL BOWLES (1875), **2**: 329, 330.
Kingsley, Rev. Charles, Canon of Westminster, England; visited BOWLES in Springfield (1874), **2**: 313, 336; visit from BOWLES in England (1874), 313.
"**Know-nothings,**" political secret society (1853), **1**: 123: became the "American party" (1854), 124.
Knowlton, Marcus P., of Springfield; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), **2**: 275.
"**Know-somethings,**" political secret society (1855), **1**: 140.
Kuklux (1866–71), origin, **2**: 125; outrages on the negroes [*see* SOUTH CAROLINA, TENNESSEE], 125, 126.

Lamar, Lucius Q. C., Democrat, U. S. Senator from Mississippi; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), **2**: 284.
Lamon, Ward H., biographer of Abraham Lincoln, **1**: 235, 239, 263.
Lane, Joseph, of Oregon; Democratic candidate for Vice-president (with Breckinridge) (1859), **1**: 261.
Lawrence, ——, of Massachusetts; candidate for Governor (1856); defeated, **1**: 173; "Constitutional Union" candidate for Governor (1860); defeated, 268.
Lawrence, Kansas, founded by anti-Slavery colonists of the New England Emigrant Aid Society (1854), **1**: 128; attacked by pro-Slavery men, 129.
Lecompte, Samuel D., Chief-Justice U. S. Territorial Court in Kansas (1856), **1**: 153; sustained the pro-Slavery Legislature, 153.
Lecompton, Kansas, Territorial Convention held at, which drew up a pro-Slavery state constitution for Kansas [*see* KANSAS] (1857), **1**: 226.
Lee, Robert E., of Virginia; convinced that paramount allegiance was due to his state, **1**: 273; commanded the Confederate army in Virginia, 343; **2**: 92.
Leonard, Mrs. N. A., of Springfield; influence in Massachusetts charities and legislation, **2**: 422.
Leonard, N. A., of Springfield; member of "The Club," **2**: 76, 150; defended BOWLES in libel suit of Willis Phelps (1875), 316; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), 274.

Lincoln, Abraham, of Illinois; President of the United States (1861–5)
his origin and self-education, **1**: 235
member of the Illinois Legislature, **1**: 235
Whig member of Congress from Illinois (1847–8), **1**: 235

Lincoln, Abraham.—*Continued.*
practiced law in Illinois, **1**: 235
opposed Slavery extension, but not an Abolitionist, **1**: 224, 235, 237, 238–242
Republican candidate for U. S. Senator against S. A. Douglas, Dem. (1858), **1**: 235
stumped Illinois, holding joint debates with Douglas on Slavery extension in the territories, **1**: 115, 238, 242
defeated, **1**: 239, 245
nominated for Presidency (1860), **1**: 263, 303
his election insured by Democratic divisions, **1**: 264, 267
Secession threatened by the South if he were elected, **1**: 265, 269
elected President, **1**: 268
his election the signal for Secession, **1**: 269
deprecated Secession or war, **1**: 280, 281, 283, 287, 319, 349
his inaugural address (March 4, 1861), **1**: 281, 285, 287
his Cabinet, **1**: 263, 282, 286
persecuted by office-seekers, **1**: 282; **2**: 88, 116
urged to war measures, **1**: 283, 284
forced to war by the attack on Fort Sumter, **1**: 40, 284, 286–288
called for 75,000 volunteers, **1**: 288
inexperienced in administration, **1**: 349
—— in war, **1**: 349
his original purpose solely to maintain the Union and Constitution, **1**: 350, 354
slow to resolve on Slavery emancipation, **1**: 350, 352, 381
offended radicals, **1**: 352, 353, 357, 360, 419, *n*
his Emancipation Proclamation (Sept. 23, 1862), **1**: 353, 354, 355, 360, 362
assailed for usurpation of power, **1**: 360, 361
renominated (1864), **1**: 360
reëlected, **1**: 362
death (April 15, 1865), **1**: 347, **2**: 116
undervalued by Bowles at first, **1**: 196, 281, 303, 318, 319
supported later by Bowles and the *Republican*, **1**: 281, 349, 352, 354, 355, 362, 363, 391; **2**: 17
reminiscences of Herndon, his law-partner, **1**: 236, 239
humor, **1**: 236, 346
melancholy temperament, **1**: 236, 346
peaceful disposition, **1**: 235, 345, 346, 349; **2**: 16
personal ambition, **1**: 237
insanity in youth, **1**: 236
unfortunate domestic life, **1**: 236
shrewd, sagacious, and patient in politics, **1**: 190, 236, 346, 349, 353; **2**: 16
firm in purpose, **1**: 237, 346; **2**: 16
tact in managing men, **1**: 236, 419, *n*
caution, **1**: 346, 353
integrity ("Honest Abe"), **1**: 235, 236, 239, 263, 346, 349
magnanimity, **1**: 236
tolerance, **1**: 346
power of his speeches and official writings, **1**: 236, 238, 240, 263, 280, 281
trusted by the people, **1**: 346, 349.

Lincoln, Ezra, of Boston; a Whig leader, **1**: 139; favored a Republican movement in Massachusetts (1855), 139; supported Gardner for Governor (1856), 174.

Lodge, Henry Cabot, of Massachusetts; recommended by Bowles for administrative efficiency (1877), **2**: 426.

Logan, Gen. John A. (1826), M. C. from Illinois; manager in impeachment of Pres. Johnson (1868), **2**: 35, 38; favored currency inflation (1873), 229.

London, England, Bowles's 1st visit and impressions (1862), **1**: 364, 366, 385; later visits (1870), **2**: 161, 162; (1871), 174; (1874), 313, 339; its shops, 162.

London *Daily News,* Bowles's liking for it (1870), **2**: 163.

London *Times,* the leading journal of the world, **1**: 193; superiority to parties, 193; its theory of journalism, **2**: 378.

Long, John D., of Hingham, Mass.; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), **2**: 274.

Long's Peak, Bowles's impression of, **2**: 3.

Lord, Judge Otis P., of Massachusetts; Democratic candidate for Congress against B. F. Butler (1868); defeated, **2**: 92, 93.

Loring, C. G., U. S. Commissioner and Massachusetts Judge of Probate; remanded a fugitive, Anthony Burns, to slavery (1854), **1**: 119, 120; his removal demanded by the Legislature (1855, '58), **1**: 132, 164; his removal refused by Gov. Gardner (1855); his removal ordered by Governor Banks (1858), 134; appointed Judge in the U. S. Court of Claims by Pres. Buchanan (1858), 134.

Louisiana [*see also* NEW ORLEANS], BOWLES traveled in, and described in letters to the [*Republican* (1844–5), **1**: 22
purchase of the "Louisiana territory" from France; its division into Missouri, etc.
Slavery established in the state, **1**: 110 [*(see also* KANSAS, NEBRASKA), **1**: 110
joined the Southern Confederacy (1861), **1**: 274
Lincoln's measures for reconstructing the state after the War (1865), **2**: 19
voted for Seymour and Blair, Presidential election (1868), **2**: 43
in political turmoil throughout Grant's 2d term (1872–7), **2**: 224, 233–237, 242
disputed state election (1872), **2**: 224
Republicans (or Radicals) procured from U. S. Judge Durell *(q. v.)* an order giving them U. S. troops; ejected McEnery *(q. v.)*, Governor-elect, and installed Kellogg *(q. v.)* as Governor, **2**: 224
Kellogg ejected as soon as troops were withdrawn, and McEnery put in power (1874), [**2**: 233
Pres. Grant gave troops to Republicans, who resumed government, **2**: 234
New Orleans Committee of Seventy appealed to the American people, **2**: 234
general political and financial disorders; Democratic majority in the Legislature destroyed by the Returning Board's unseating members-elect and their ejectment by U. S. troops (1874–5), **2**: 234, 235, 283
meetings held throughout the North to protest against the usurpation of power by the [Grant Administration (Jan., 1875), **2**: 235, 236
Pres. Grant referred the question to Congress; a House Committee visited New Orleans, censured the Returning Board and the exclusion of Democratic legislators, **2**: 237, 287
a compromise effected, making Kellogg Governor, and giving Legislature to the [Democrats, **2**: 237
efforts of Democrats to conciliate negro voters during the Hayes-Tilden Presidential [campaign (1876), **2**: 279, 284, 287
Nicholls (Dem.) candidate for Governor, against Packard (Carpet-bagger), **2**: 279
vote for President disputed, there being a Democratic majority, but a Republican [Returning Board, **2**: 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 292, 298, 303
visits of congressmen, editors, politicians, etc., to New Orleans, **2**: 284
untrustworthy witnesses alleged intimidation of negro voters, **2**: 287
Congressional Visiting Committee vindicated the Returning Board, giving the vote to [Hayes and Packard, **2**: 287
Packard given the Governorship by the Returning Board; the Democrats organized [an opposition Legislature, repudiating him, **2**: 288, 289
peace maintained by Federal troops, **2**: 289, 305
Electoral Commission gave vote of the state to Hayes, **2**: 298, 299, 300
protests against the action of the Commission and of Congress, **2**: 298–304
Hayes promised to withdraw troops and cease Federal interference (1877), **2**: 302
troops withdrawn by Pres. Hayes; collapse of the Carpet-bag government, **2**: 305
Nicholls recognized as Governor, **2**: 305
both parties unite in electing Spofford (Liberal Dem.) to U. S. Senate, **2**: 305, 420,
members of the Returning Board given Federal offices, **2**: 306. [428–430

Louisville, Ky., *Courier-Journal* [*see also* HALDEMAN *and* WATTERSON], influential in preventing Kentucky from seceding (1861), **2**: 134; a leader in the "Independent Journalism" movement (1868), 133; its efforts to eradicate "Bourbonism" and promote political progress in Kentucky and the South after the War, 134; promoted the Liberal Republican movement and its Cincinnati Convention (1872), 178; favored nomination of C. F. Adams for President, 181; reluctantly supported Greeley when nominated, 187; a hard-money paper, but subordinated finance to Democratic success in election of 1875, 245; its obituary of BOWLES (1878), 449.

Lowell, Prof. James Russell, of Cambridge, Mass.; his opposition to Slavery, **1**: 74; his *Biglow Papers* on the Mexican War (1846–8), 47; his *Biglow Papers* on the War of Secession (1861–5), 345; signed address of Reform Republican Conference, Worcester (1876), **2**: 274; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), 275.

Lunt, George, of Newburyport, Mass., **1**: 301.

"**Machine,**" its function in American politics, **2**: 270, *n.*; smashed in Massachusetts election (1874), 272.

Maine, Republicans carried state election by bribery (1872), **2**: 196, 199.

Mann, Horace, of Massachusetts; lost Whig renomination to Congress *in* 1850 by opposing Webster's pro-Slavery course, **1**: 91; elected to Congress by the Free-soil party (1850), **1**: 91; a statue of him proposed (1859), 300.

Marcy, William L. (1786–1857), of New York; Secretary of State in President

Pierce's Cabinet, **1**: 130; evaded question of Slavery in Kansas, 130.
Marshall, Samuel S., Democrat, M. C. from Illinois; on committee to investigate Louisiana political troubles (1875), **2**: 237; reported, condemning the Kellogg government, 237.

Maryland, her doubtful attitude as to Secession (1861), **1**: 280
invaded by the rebels, **1**: 343
voted for Seymour (Dem.) for President (1868), **2**: 42
—— for Greeley (Dem.) for President (1872), **2**: 200.

Mason, James M., U. S. Senator from Virginia; proposed the Fugitive Slave Law (1850), **1**: 83; advocated extension of Slavery (1854), 116; applauded Preston S. Brooks's assault upon Sumner (1856), 147; threatened Secession in case of a Republican election (1856), 148; seized at sea, as a commissioner of the Confederacy, and surrendered to the British government (1861), 332.

Massachusetts [*see also* BOWLES, SPRINGFIELD, *and* SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN]
its early settlement, **1**: 5
Puritan influences on its social and political life, **1**: 5–11, 34, 190; **2**: 11, 454
Puritanism gradually liberalized, **2**: 394, 454
Unitarianism, **1**: 11, 12
Transcendentalism, etc., **1**: 34
local self-government, **1**: 6, 10
sent colonists to the West, **1**: 11, 128
influence of the clergy, **1**: 6, 7, 8, 74
public education, **1**: 8
—— ability to read and write required of voters, **2**: 19
politics: originally shaped by English Puritans, **1**: 6
—— influenced by the Revolution, **1**: 7, 10
—— —— national growth, **1**: 7
—— —— Slavery, **1**: 45
—— —— —— the Abolitionists, **1**: 49, 74, 87–90, 131, 154, 190, 350
—— Whigs, led by Webster (*q. v.*), opposed Slavery extension, **1**: 41, 46, 48
—— Democrats nominated Caleb Cushing for Governor, ignoring question of Slavery; Whigs opposed Slavery extension and Mexican war (1847), **1**: 48
—— Whigs, disgusted at Gen. Taylor's receiving Presidential nomination, instead of Webster or Clay, sent delegates to National Free-soil Convention, at Buffalo, which nominated Van Buren for President and C. F. [Adams for Vice-president (1848), **1**: 52, 54, 55
—— Whig Party ruined by Webster's Compromise speech in U. S. Senate [(March 7, 1850), **1**: 77, 78, 90, 91, 118, 121, 122, 123, 131, 139
—— anti-Slavery sentiment fomented by enforcement of the Fugitive Slave [Law (1851), **1**: 83–87, 119
—— Democrats and Free-soilers coalesced, electing Boutwell (Dem.) Governor, [and Sumner to U. S. Senate (1851), **1**: 90–92
—— Whig State Convention supported Webster and the Constitution, *i. e.*, return of fugitive slaves, and nominated Winthrop for Governor, Springfield (Sept. 11, 1851); carried the state by reduced majorities, **1**: 93–94
—— voted for Scott (Whig) for President, against Hale (Free-soil) and Pierce [(Dem.), who was elected (1852), **1**: 95
—— Whigs carried state election over a coalition (1853), **1**: 117
—— entire Congressional delegation voted against the Kansas-Nebraska Bill [(1854), **1**: 116, 126, 128
—— Massachusetts members of Congress called a meeting, in Washington, at which the Republican party was organized, to resist spread of Slavery, [(May 26, 1854), **1**: 117
—— general indignation at arrest, in Boston, of Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave, [and his rendition to Slavery, **1**: 119–121, 132–134
—— Republican State Convention, composed of Free-soil men, nominated Henry [Wilson for Governor (1854), **1**: 121, 123, 139. 140
—— Whig State Convention renominated Gov. Emory Washburn, and demanded [repeal of Fugitive Slave Law, **1**: 122, 139
—— rise of the American (Know-nothing) party (1853–54), **1**: 123–125
—— Know-nothings elected H. J. Gardner Governor, over Washburn, Beach (Dem.), and Wilson, all the 12 Congressmen, and majority of the Legisla- [ture (1854), **1**: 125, 126, 127, 132

Massachusetts.—*Continued.*
politics: Legislature incorporated (Feb., 1854) the New England Aid Society, which equipped anti-Slavery colonists, who founded Lawrence, Kansas
—— chaotic state of parties, **1**: 131–141 [*(see* KANSAS), **1**: 128
—— Henry Wilson *(q. v.)*, elected to U. S. Senate, **1**: 132, 136
—— Legislature passed a Personal Liberty Bill, frustrating the Fugitive Slave [Law (1855), **1**: 121, 134, 135
—— Republican party organized by Wilson, BOWLES, Lincoln, etc. (1855), **1**: [139, 140, 141
—— Know-nothing Council, Springfield, opposed citizenship of foreigners, and [Slavery extension (Aug. 7, 1855), **1**: 140
—— "Know-somethings" merged in Republican party, **1**: 140
—— Republican State Convention, Worcester (Sept. 20); declared against Slavery extension, and nominated Julius Rockwell for Governor, **1**: 141–143
—— Democratic State Convention denounced Know-nothingism, opposition to Slavery, indorsed S. A. Douglas's squatter sovereignty doctrine, and nominated E. D. Beach for Governor (Sept. 5), **1**: 141.
—— Whig State Convention nominated S. H. Walley for Governor, **1**: 143
—— Know-nothings nominated Gardner for Governor; elected him, **1**: 144
—— in Presidential election Democrats, Whigs, and Know-nothings united [against the Republicans (1856), **1**: 154–159
—— vote of the state for Fremont (Rep.) for President; Gardner reëlected Gov- [ernor, **1**: 160
—— Republicans, with faction of Know-nothings, elected Banks Governor over [Gardner (Know-nothing) (1857), **1**: 243
—— anti-Slavery men (not representative Republicans or Abolitionists) promoted [John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry, Va. (1859), **1**: 250
—— protest against Brown's hasty and unfair trial, and his execution (Oct.–Dec.), **1**: 251–255
—— Republicans elected John A. Andrew Governor over Beach (Douglas Dem.), Butler (Breckinridge Dem.), and Lawrence (American); and carried state for Lincoln for President (1860), **1**: 268
—— the "Machine" maintained in both parties in spite of general desire for non- [partisan support of the War, **1**: 355, 356
—— Republicans reëlected Andrew Governor (1861, '63, '64), **1**: 356, 359, 361, [362
—— voted for Lincoln's reëlection, against McClellan (Dem.), (1864), **1**: 362
—— Republican State Convention called for impartial suffrage (1866), **2**: 26
—— attempt of moderate Republicans to suppress Gen. B. F. Butler in politics, by defeating his reëlection to Congress (1868); his support by the Machine politicians and Radicals, **2**: 92, 93, 96
—— legislation controlled by railroad jobbers and lobbyists, **2**: 102, 103, 106
—— —— Hoosac Tunnel job, **2**: 102
—— —— Hartford and Erie *(afterward* New York and New England R. [R. Co.), **2**: 103, 104, 105, 158, 161
—— —— Boston and Albany R. R., **2**: 276
—— Republicans elected Wm. Claflin Governor (1868), **2**: 106
—— Republicans urged to lessen public expenditure (1869), **2**: 104
—— Gen. Butler sought Republican nomination for Governor, was supported by appointees of the Grant Administration, but defeated by Wm. B. Washburn, who was elected over J. Q. Adams (Dem.) (1871), **2**: 106–109
—— Republican State Convention declared for the reëlection of Gen. Grant as [President, with Wilson as Vice-president (1872), **2**: 179
—— Liberal Republicans few, **2**: 179
—— Republican Legislature elected Boutwell to succeed Wilson as U. S. Senator, [defeating Dawes *(q. v.)* (1873), **2**: 264, 301
—— Butler, supported by the Grant Administration, again sought Republican nomination for Governor; again beaten by Washburn, who was reëlected over Gaston (Dem.), (1873), **2**: 264–266
—— both Massachusetts Senators and 7 of the 11 Representatives protested in vain against Pres. Grant's appointment to the Collectorship of Boston of Simmons, a political henchman of Butler (1873), **2**: 266
—— Republican Legislature elected Gov. Washburn to succeed Sumner as U. S. Senator, defeating Judge Hoar and Dawes, who was supported by Butler (1873), **2**: 266, 267

Massachusetts.—*Continued.*
politics: Republican "Machine" overthrown in the state election of 1874; Gaston (Dem.) elected Governor over Washburn (Rep.); C. P. Thompson (Dem.) to Congress over Butler; and Gen. Banks and Prof. Seelye (Independent) over Republican competitors (1874), **2**: 269–273
—— Republican Legislature elected Dawes (Rep.) to U. S. Senate over Hoar [(Rep.) and C. F. Adams and Judge Abbott (Dem.), (1874), **2**: 273
—— Republicans elected A. H. Rice Governor over Gaston (Dem.), (1875), **2**: [273, 274
—— Reform Republicans held conference to protest against caucuses and the Ma- [chine, Worcester (April, 1876), **2**: 274
—— Republican State Convention sent a Reform delegation, mostly supporters of Bristow for President, to the Cincinnati National Convention (1876), **2**: 274, 275
—— Republicans reëlected Rice Governor over C. F. Adams (Dem.); elected Butler to Congress over Judge Hoar (Ind.); and gave electoral vote for President to Hayes over Tilden (1876), **2**: 275–277
—— Republican Legislature elected G. F. Hoar to U. S. Senate over Boutwell [(1877), **2**: 277
—— Two Massachusetts Representatives, Pierce and Seelye, only Republican Members of Congress to protest against partisan award of the Louisiana vote by the Electoral Commission in the Hayes-Tilden disputed election case (1877), **2**: 298, 299
supported the War against Secession, **1**: 283, 355, 361, 362, 416
prompt military preparations by Gov. Andrew and the Legislature (Dec., 1860), **1**: 283
her Sixth Regiment the first to follow Pennsylvania troops to defend Washington [(April, 1861), **1**: 288
high quality of her troops during the War, **1**: 345
intense loyalty of public sentiment, **1**: 345, 349
general demand that the War should include the destruction of Slavery, **1**: 350, 354, 355.

Matthews, Stanley, Republican, of Ohio; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), **2**: 284; counsel for the Republicans before the Electoral Commission, 297.
Maynard, E. B., of Springfield, Massachusetts; defended BOWLES in libel suit of Willis Phelps (1875), **2**: 316.
Maynard, Horace, of Tennessee, **2**: 26.
Mayo, Rev. A. D., pastor of the Church of the Unity, Springfield; his memorial sermon delineating BOWLES's character (1878), **2**: 450.
McClellan, Maj.-Gen. George B., U. S. Army; organized and trained the Army of the Potomac (1861), **1**: 342; his failures in Virginia, 342, 343, 361; interfered with by Pres. Lincoln's Administration, 359, 360; opposed Lincoln's Emancipation policy, 360; removed from command, 360; Democratic candidate for President (1864), 359, 360, 361; defeated by Lincoln's reëlection, 362; opposed by the *Republican*, 361, 362.
McComb, ——, charged Oakes Ames with bribery in the Credit Mobilier affair (1872), **2**: 196, 217.
McCrary, George W., Republican, M. C. from Iowa; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), 288; advocated creation of an electoral commission, 294; counsel for the Republicans before the Electoral Commission, 297; Secretary of War in Pres. Hayes's Cabinet (1877), 304.
McCullough, Hugh, Secretary of the Treasury in Pres. Johnson's Cabinet, **2**: 52, 240; excursion, with BOWLES, etc., to Pennsylvania coal regions (1866), 52.
McCunn, ——, Judge in New York City; directed arrest of BOWLES for libel of Fiske, Jr. (1868), **2**: 95.
McDonald, Sir John A., commissioner on the Canada Fisheries question, etc. (1871), **2**: 121.
McEnery, ——, of Louisiana; declared by the Conservatives to be elected Governor over Kellogg (1872), **2**: 224; repudiated by the Republicans, 224; dispossessed by U. S. troops, 224, 233; installed in the Governorship on the withdrawal of troops (1873), 233; again dispossessed by U. S. troops (1875), 234, 235; sustained by New Orleans Committee of Seventy, 234; question referred to Congress by Pres. Grant (Jan., 1875), 236, 242); sustained by report of Congressional Investigating Committee, 236; excluded by Congress in favor of Kellogg, 237.
McLean, John, of Ohio; Justice U. S. Supreme Court; dissented from Chief-Justice Taney's decision in Dred Scott case (1857), **1**: 220.
Mexico, war with (1844–8) [*see* WARS]; purchase of territory from, sought by the Buchanan Administration, **1**: 246.
Michigan, first victory of the new Republican party (1854), **1**: 117.

Mill, John Stuart, review of his posthumous essays in the *Republican* (1874), **2**: 401.
Miller, Samuel F., Justice U. S. Supreme Court, Republican, **2**: 292; member of the Electoral Commission (1876), 292, 294, 296; voted with the Republican majority ("8 to 7"), 297, 298, 299, 300; rebuked for partisanship, 300, 301.

Mississippi, joined the Southern Confederacy (1861), **1**: 274
not "reconstructed" in time to vote at Presidential election (1868), **2**: 43
"reconstructed," and Representatives admitted to Congress (1870), **2**: 115
her (Republican) Legislature adopted the 15th Constitutional Amendment (enfranchising negroes, etc.), completing its ratification, **2**: 115
oppressed by Carpet-bag rule; consequent intimidation of negroes, **2**: 248
Gov. Ames applied for Federal troops; refused by Attorney-Gen. Pierrepont (1875), Conservatives carried the elections (1875), **2**: 249. [**2**: 248
Mississippi River recovered by Union armies, **1**: 343; commercial importance of, 344.
Missouri, organized as a state from the "Louisiana purchase" territory (1820), **1**: 110
Slavery established in, **1**: 110
the "Missouri Compromise" (1850), **1**: 110, 112, 220, 221
—— —— its repeal, **1**: 110, 112–117, 137, 142, 146, 235, 238
—— —— its restoration urged by Thurlow Weed, Crittenden, etc., as a means of averting Secession (1860), **1**: [276, 279, 280
states formed from its territory [*see* KANSAS, NEBRASKA]
furnished pro-Slavery ruffians, who terrorized Kansas, **1**: 129
pro-Slavery decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott (*q. v.*) (1857), John Brown's raid into, to liberate slaves, **1**: 249 [**1**: 220–223
voted for Douglas for President (1860), **1**: 268
contained a strong party desiring Slavery Emancipation, **1**: 270, 280; **2**: 177
—— party seeking Secession, **1**: 280; **2**: 177
freedom to slaves of rebels proclaimed by Gen. Fremont, but withheld by Pres. Lincoln, **1**: 352
voted for Grant for President (1868), **2**: 42 [(1872), **2**: 185, 186
Liberal Republican movement originated in (1872), **2**: 177
Gratz Brown urged for the Presidency by her delegation at Cincinnati Convention
voted for Greeley for President (1872), **2**: 200.

Missouri River, the western limit of known civilization until Pacific Railroads were built, **2**: 2, 10.
Mitchell, Dr. S. Weir, of Philadelphia; consulted by BOWLES for his health (1877), **2**: 428.
Montgomery, Ala., original capital of the Southern Confederacy, **1**: 288.
Mormons [*see* UTAH].
Morrill, Justin S., U. S. Senator from Vermont; opposed Pres. Grant's deposition of Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), **2**: 130.
Morrill, Lot M., Republican, U. S. Senator from Maine; opposed Pres. Grant's deposition of Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), **2**: 130; Secretary of the Treasury in Grant's Cabinet (1876), 261.
Morris, Henry, of Massachusetts; counsel for Willis Phelps in libel suit against BOWLES (1875), **2**: 316.
Morrison, ——, M. C. from Illinois; chairman of Committee (1875), **2**: 249; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 284.
Morton, Oliver P., U. S. Senator from Illinois; influence with Pres. Grant's Administration, **2**: 115, 194; sustained Grant in displacing Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), 130; favored currency inflation (1873), 229; attempted to pass the Force Bill (1875), 240, 259; recanted his inflation theories during Ohio canvass (1875), 245; aspired to the Presidency, 250, 259; candidate for Presidential nomination, Cincinnati Convention (1876), 259, 260; took the stump for Hayes, 281; his anti-Southern partisanship, 294; urged enactment of a law providing for disputed Presidential elections, 284, 306; on joint Committee of Conference as to disputed electoral votes for President (1876), 288; opposed the bill creating the Electoral Commission, 294, 295; made member of the Commission, 295, 296; voted and argued with the Republican majority ("8 to 7"), 297, 298, 299, 300; ignored by Pres. Hayes, 304.
Moses, Franklin J., Jr., Republican, "Carpet-bag" Governor of South Carolina, **2**: 124; imprisoned in Massachusetts for swindling, 124.
Motley, J. Lothrop, of Boston; proposed diplomatic appointment (1869), **2**: 144; recalled from English mission, 128.
Mount Hood, BOWLES's impressions of, **2**: 3.
Mount Tom, Mass., **1**: 14; **2**: 410.
Mount Washington, BOWLES's visit to (1861), **1**: 324, 325.

Mozoomdar, P. C., his tribute to Emerson given in the *Republican*, **2**: 365.
Mulligan, James, of Boston, Mass.; his relations with J. G. Blaine, **2**: 257, 258.
Murphy, Thomas, Collector of the Port of New York, **2**: 132; an adherent of Senator Conkling, 132, 194; dismissed by Pres. Grant, 132.

Nast, Thomas, his caricatures of Greeley (1872), **2**: 197.
Nebraska, organized as a territory out of the Missouri territory (1854), **1**: 110–116; struggle as to the establishment of Slavery in, 110–117, 126, 128, 137 [*see also* KANSAS].
Nelson, Samuel, Justice of U. S. Supreme Court; commissioner on the *Alabama* claims, Canada Fisheries, etc. (1871), **2**: 121.
Nevada, BOWLES's visit and impressions (1865), **2**: 5, 14.
New England Emigrant Aid Society, established to exclude Slavery from Kansas (1854), **1**: 128; founded the town of Lawrence, Kansas, 128.
New Haven, Conn., Samuel Bowles (II.) worked as a printer in, **1**: 3; visits of BOWLES to (1869), **2**: 151; BOWLES's liking for the place, 157.
New Haven *Journal*, favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), **2**: 253.

New Jersey, elections carried by the Democrats (1855), **1**: 144
its Democratic vote charged to lack of public education (1856), **1**: 161
only Northern state to give a Democratic vote in Presidential election (1860), **1**: 268
state election Democratic (1862), **1**: 356
voted for McClellan (Dem.) for President (1864), **1**: 362
—— Seymour (Dem.) for President (1868), **2**: 42
—— Tilden (Dem.) for President (1876), **2**: 283.
New Mexico, obtained as a result of the war with Mexico (1846–48), **1**: 47, 74
purpose to establish Slavery in, **1**: 74
its territorial organization, without provision as to Slavery, proposed by Henry Clay [(1849), **1**: 76
exclusion of Slavery declared by Webster to be "a superfluous reënactment of the law [of God," because of climate, etc., **1**: 77
admission as a state, with local option as to Slavery, proposed by C. F. Adams, as a [means of averting Secession (1861), **1**: 297.

New Orleans, La. [*see also* LOUISIANA], taken by Union army, **1**: 343; ruled by Gen. Butler, **2**: 91; misrule by Carpetbag politicians under the Grant Administration, 131, 234, 236; a committee of 70 set forth to the nation the misrule of the Radicals; indignation meetings in the North (1874), 234–236; visited by Congressional investigating committees (1875), 236; Returning Board at, counted vote of Louisiana for Hayes, for President; visits of Congressional committees, politicians, editors, etc. (1876), 283, 284, 287, 289; visited by Commission sent by Pres. Hayes, to adjust difficulties (1877), 305.
New York (City), decline of partisan journalism before the war, **1**: 193, 194; its vote controlled for the Buchanan Administration by Fernando Wood (1857), 228; slave-traders sent out from, 246; its mob resisted the drafts; held down by Gen. Butler (1863), 398; **2**: 91; National Democratic Convention, nominating Horatio Seymour for President (1868), 40–42; its proceedings reported by BOWLES, 40–42; its municipal affairs, courts, bar, etc., controlled by the Tweed Ring (1868, etc.), 94, 98, 101; Tweed Ring overthrown (1871), 109; the Erie Ring (Fisk, Gould, etc.) allied with the Tweed Ring, 94, 98, 104; exposed by the *Republican* and other journals (1868), 94–101, 104; sued the *Republican* for libel; arrested BOWLES, 94–96; sustained in legal matters by David Dudley Field and others, 97–101; BOWLES's visits to, *in* 1857, **1**: 290; *in* 1859, 299; *in* 1868, **2**: 40, 56, 77, 95; *in* 1869, 151; *in* 1870, 155, 156; *in* 1871, 168, 169; *in* 1875, 345; residence of Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES at Brevoort House in, for medical treatment (1861), **1**: 311, 323, 330–334; *in* 1863, 400; *in* 1866, **2**: 48; its theaters appreciated by BOWLES, 77; his liking for the city, 157; the Fisk and Gould corner in Wall St.; "Black Friday" scandal (Sept., 1869), 104; abuses by the Grant Administration in patronage, Custom-house Ring, etc., 132, 232; indignation meeting in Cooper Institute to protest against usurpation of power in the South by the Grant Administration (1875), 235; conference of Civil Service Reformers (April, 1876), 254, 255.

New York (State), early political traditions, Dutch and English, **1**: 10
carried by the Whigs on the anti-Nebraska issue (1854), **1**: 117
—— by the Americans (Know-nothings) (1855). **1**: 144
—— —— for Fremont, for President (1856), **1**: 160
anti-Slavery legislation caused by the Dred Scott decision of the U. S. Supreme Court [(1857), **1**: 223

New York (State).—*Continued.*
elections carried by Union ticket, over Democratic opposition (1861), **1**: 356
Democratic election; Horatio Seymour Governor (1862), **1**: 356
controlled by the Democrats during the war, **1**: 357
voted for Lincoln's reëlection as President (1865), **1**: 362
state elections Democratic (1867), **2**: 34
voted for Seymour (Dem.) for President (1868), **2**: 42
state elections Democratic, electing S. J. Tilden Governor (1874), **2**: 233, 245
the lobby besetting its Legislature, **2**: 103
its Democratic party influenced by Tammany Hall, Tweed, etc. (1871), **2**: 136, 137, [245, 246
Grant (Conkling) and anti-Grant (Fenton) factions in the Republican party, **2**: 176,
Tammany faction in the Republican party, **2**: 183, 247 [183, 423, 424
—— suppressed by Tilden's Democratic following (1872), **2**: 190, 245,
Tilden's reforms: Tammany, Tweed Ring, Canal Ring, etc., **2**: 191, 245–248 [246
voted for Grant's reëlection as President, against Greeley (1872), **2**: 200
Democrats elected state officers; Republicans carried the Legislature (1875), **2**: 247
reform in state politics obstructed by G. W. Curtis and *Harper's Weekly*, **2**: 247
Republican State Convention favored Conkling for President, but afraid to instruct [their delegates (1876), **2**: 255
delegation to Cincinnati National Republican Convention favored Conkling, but were [unsupported by other states, **2**: 259
corruptionist element of delegation to St. Louis National Democratic Convention [opposed Tilden's nomination for President (1876), **2**: 260
Robinson, Democratic candidate for Governor (1876), **2**: 281
voted for Tilden (Dem.) for President, **2**: 283.

New York *Anti-Slavery Standard* favored disunion (1859), **1**: 258; favored Lincoln's reëlection as President (1864), 413.

New York *Commercial Advertiser* belittled Gov. Tilden's reforms in New York, and declared that real reforms came only from the Republican party (1875), **2**: 247.

New York *Evening Post*, a leader in the "Independent Journalism" movement, **2**: 133; promoted Liberal Republican movement and its Cincinnati Convention (1872), 178; repudiated Greeley's nomination for President, 188, 192, 193; furthered Blaine's political aspirations (1873), 333; praised the *Republican* and BOWLES, after his death, 72.

New York *Financial Chronicle*, opposed Sherman's Resumption of Specie Payment Bill (1875), **2**: 241.

New York *Herald*, a new departure in journalism, founded by J. G. Bennett, *in* 1835, **1**: 27; novel newspaper methods, 28, 29; **2**: 366; news-getting, **1**: 28; inaugurated reports of religious societies, etc., **2**: 366; fomented Secession sentiment (1859), **1**: 257; was believed in the South to represent Northern views, 258; its outlay for war news (1861–65), 347; its fair treatment of the Hayes-Tilden disputed Presidential election question (1876); favored decision by an Electoral Commission, **2**: 293.

New York *Independent*, supported Gen. B. F. Butler in politics (1868), **2**: 93.

New York *Ledger*, nature of its popularity, **2**: 97.

New York *Nation*, its criticism of BOWLES's book, *Across the Continent* (1866), **2**: 46; the *Republican's* estimate of its place in journalism, 97, 337; its hostility to Gen. B. F. Butler, 92, 96; not loved by Radicals, 93; its tendency to biased judgments, 337; a leader in the "Independent Journalism" movement, 133, 178; approved the *Republican's* attack on D. D. Field's help to the Erie Ring, but was silent (1871), 168; promoted Liberal Republican movement and its Cincinnati Convention (1872), 178; repudiated Greeley's nomination for President, 188, 193; its preference in the Hayes-Tilden Presidential campaign (1876) indiscernible, 281; lost 3000 subscribers for disbelieving that Hayes could honestly accept votes of the Louisiana and Florida Returning Boards, 303; furthered Blaine's political aspirations (1873), 333; eulogium of BOWLES's journalistic work (1878), 449.

New York *Sun*, a pioneer of modern journalism founded *in* 1833, **1**: 27, 29.

New York *Times*, founded by H. J. Raymond, **1**: 29; sued for libel by James Fisk, Jr., for exposing Erie Ring (1868), **2**: 94; exposed the Tweed and Tammany Ring (1871–2), 109; business and political rivalry with the N. Y. *Tribune*, 189; personally abusive of BOWLES (1872), 219, 220; opposed the Grant Administration's Force Bill (1875), 238; supported Sherman's Resumption of Specie Payment Bill (1875), 241; belittled Gov. Tilden's reforms in New York State (1875), 246; favored nomination of Bristow for President (1876), 253; opposed Electoral Commission to determine the disputed Hayes-Tilden Presidential election (1876), 293; its attention to public

charities, reforms, etc., 375; praised Bowles's editorial methods (1878), **1**: 198.

New York *Tribune*, founded by Horace Greeley (*q. v.*), *in* 1841, **1**: 28; as a newspaper, 29; **2**: 182; as a social educator, **1**: 29; as a political reformer, 29; **2**: 178, 183, 189; as a Whig organ, **1**: 29; nature of its popularity, **2**: 97; excluded from the mails in Southern States, under Buchanan's Administration, **1**: 258; its reports of the Know-nothing Convention, Philadelphia (1855–6), by Bowles, 137, 138, 149, 165, 166, 167; Bowles asked to be its Washington correspondent (1856), 173, 180; Bowles thought of accepting an editorial position on (1857–9), 290, 301; supported Bates for Republican Presidential nomination (1860), 263; averse to war, and ready to let the South "go in peace" (1861), 277; urged generous policy toward the conquered South (1865), **2**: 124, 183, 195; represented by A. D. Richardson on the trip "Across the Continent" (1865), 1; supported B. F. Butler in politics (1868), 93; sued for libel by James Fisk, Jr. (1868), 94; approved the *Republican's* attack on D. D. Field and the Erie Ring, but was silent (1871), 168; estranged from Pres. Grant's Administration, 175, 183; favored the Liberal Republican movement, except as to Free-trade, etc. (1872), 178, 183, 189; business and political rivalry with the N. Y. *Times*, 189; crippled by Greeley's Presidential campaign and death (1872), 200; its management acquired by Whitelaw Reid, 184; returned to Republicanism, 223, 354, 355; opposed Sherman's Resumption of Specie Payment Bill (1875), 241; deciphered secret telegraphic dispatches to Democratic agents in the South concerning Presidential votes for Tilden (1876), 290; opposed Electoral Commission to determine the Presidential election, 293.

New York *World*, sued for libel by Jas. Fisk, Jr., for exposing Erie Ring (1868), **2**: 94; favored Liberal Republican movement, provided C. F. Adams were nominated for President (1872), 178; opposed Electoral Commission to determine the Hayes-Tilden disputed Presidential election (1876), 293.

Niagara Falls, Bowles's description of (1854), **1**: 101; **2**: 84.

Nicaragua, Wm. Walker's filibustering attacks upon, connived at by Buchanan's Administration and the South, **1**: 246.

Nicholls, Francis T., Democratic candidate for Governor of Louisiana (1876), **2**: 279; declared defeated by the Returning Board, 288; supported by seceding faction of the Legislature, 288, 289; repressed by U. S. troops, sent by Pres. Grant, 289, 302; troops withdrawn by Pres. Hayes (1877), 305; recognized as Governor, 305.

Noah, Major, editor of New York *Enquirer*, **1**: 26.

Northampton, Mass., Dr. Denniston's water-cure there frequented by Bowles (1861), **1**: 311, 328–330.

Northcote, Sir Stafford, British Commissioner on the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), **2**: 121.

North Carolina, aristocratic influences in its early political development, **1**: 10
reluctant to secede (1861), **1**: 280
offered a place in Pres. Lincoln's Cabinet, **1**: 282
joined the Southern Confederacy after the fall of Sumter (April, 1861), **1**: 288
voted for Grant for President (1868), **2**: 43.

North-western Boundary (between Canada and United States), referred for arbitration to the Emperor of Germany (1871), **2**: 121.

Norwich, Conn., *Bulletin*, favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), **2**: 253.

O'Conor, Charles, of New York; opposed the Tammany Hall Democratic faction (1871), **2**: 137; counsel for the Democrats before the Presidential Electoral Commission (1876), 297.

Ogden, Utah, point of completion of the Central and Union Pacific Railroads (May 10, 1869), **2**: 11.

Ohio, sent an "anti-Nebraska" delegation to Congress (1854), **1**: 117
popularity of Fremont, Republican Presidential candidate (1856), **1**: 172
elections for the Republicans (1858), **1**: 244
—— for the Democrats (1862), **1**: 356
—— for the Republicans, reëlecting Lincoln President (1864), **1**: 362
—— for the Democrats (1867), **2**: 34
—— —— (1874), **2**: 233
elected R. B. Hayes (Rep.) Governor over Gov. Wm. Allen (Dem.), who favored an inconvertible paper currency (1875), **2**: 244, 245, 348
its vote doubtful in Presidential campaign (1876); voted for Hayes, **2**: 281, 283.

Olmsted, Frederick Law, of New York; on parks in cities, **2**: 56; meetings with Bowles, 170.

Oregon, Bowles's 1st visit and impressions (1865), **2**: 5, 9; voted for Seymour (Dem.) for President (1868), 42; Mr. and

Mrs. BOWLES traveled in (1869), 147; vote for President disputed, an elector being ineligible (1876), 283, 291, 299, 300; visits from political agents, 290; controversy between the parties, 291, 292; vote given to Hayes, 300.
Orr, James L., M. C. from South Carolina; threatened disunion (1859), **1**: 259.
Osgood, Rev. Dr. Samuel, of New York; his preaching, **1**: 413.
Otis, George K., led the editorial excursion "Across the Continent" (1865), **2**: 2.
Ottendorfer, Oswald, editor of the N. Y. *Staats Zeitung*; opposed the Tammany Hall Democratic faction (1871), **2**: 137.
Oxford, Kansas, having 11 houses, returned 1624 pro-Slavery votes (1857), **1**: 226.
Packard, Stephen B., leader of the Radical (Republican) faction in Louisiana (1872), **2**: 224, 279; supported by Pres. Grant's Administration, 224; candidate for Governor, against Nicholls (1876), 279; declared elected by the Returning Board, 288; supported by remnant of the Legislature, after Democrats seceded, 288; by U. S. troops, 289, 302; refused further support by Pres. Grant (1877), 305; collapse of his government, 305.
Pacific States [*see the States, etc., severally, viz.*,

Alaska,	Idaho,
Arizona,	Nevada,
California,	Oregon,
Colorado,	Utah,
Dakota,	Washington,

Wyoming.]
Their isolation from the Eastern States before the building of the Pacific railroads, **2**: 2; BOWLES's visits to and impressions: *see* BOWLES, SAMUEL.
Palfrey, John Gorham, of Mass.; anti-Slavery attitude in Massachusetts Whig Convention (1847), **1**: 48; leader in the Free-soil Party, **1**: 90, 91, 93, 122; defeated for Governor by R. C. Winthrop (1851), 194.
Paris, BOWLES's visits to (1862), **1**: 370, 385; (1870), **2**: 162; (1874), 313, 339, 340.
Parker, Rev. Theodore, of Boston, Mass.; opposed Slavery, **1**: 74; addressed mass meeting, denouncing the rendition of Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave, Boston (1854), 119; as a theological reformer, 381, 409, 410, 411; **2**: 159, 380, 396; his *Life*, by John Weiss (1864), **1**: 410.
Parton, James, of New York, **2**: 151.
Parton, Mrs. James ("Fanny Fern"), of New York, **2**: 151.
Patterson, James W., U. S. Senator from New Hampshire; found guilty of falsehood in Credit Mobilier bribery investigation; escaped expulsion by expiration of his term (1872), **2**: 227.
Payne, Henry B., Democrat, M. C. from Ohio; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), **2**: 288; on Presidential Electoral Commission, 296.
Peabody, Wm. B. O., pastor Unitarian Church, Springfield, **1**: 12; **2**: 403.
Pendleton, George H., of Ohio, Democratic candidate for Vice-president (1864), **1**: 360; named for Democratic Presidential candidate (1868), **2**: 40.
Pennington, William, Republican, M. C. from New Jersey, elected Speaker of the House (1859), **1**: 257.

Pennsylvania, early social influence of the Quakers, **1**: 10
elections carried by the Democrats (1855), **1**: 144
vote doubtful in Presidential campaign (1856); given to Buchanan (Dem.), **1**: 153, [154, 160
its Democratic vote charged to lack of public schools, **1**: 161
elections for the Republicans (1858), **1**: 244
sent first troops for defense of Washington in the War (April, 1861), **1**: 288
state election Democratic (1862), **1**: 356
—— —— *in* 1867, **2**: 34
—— —— *in* 1874, **2**: 233
BOWLES's visit to the coal regions of (1866), **2**: 52–54
its industrial and financial interests, **2**: 53, 200
the lobby besetting its Legislature, **2**: 103
Republicans carried state election by bribery (1872), **2**: 196, 199, 200
—— —— Presidential election, **2**: 200.

Perry, Prof. A. L., of Williamstown, Mass., writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389.
Petersburg, Va., siege of, **1**: 343, 363; said to have been provisioned by Gen. B. F. Butler, **2**: 92.
Phelps, Edward H., local editor of the *Republican*, **1**: 388, 389; **2**: 68; owned shares in the *Republican*, **2**: 201; partnership dissolved by BOWLES (1872), 203; engaged in rival newspaper, the Springfield *Union* (1872), 204–209; urged BOWLES's nomination for Mayor of Springfield (1873), 332.
Phelps, William Walter, Republican, M. C. from New Jersey, on Committee to visit Louisiana and investigate political troubles (1875), **2**: 236; reported in condemnation of Gov. Kellogg's government, 236.

Phelps, Willis, of Springfield, **2**: 310, 318; his railroad building operations, 310; sought concessions from city government, 310, 311, 317, 318; from Massachusetts Legislature, 310, 311, 317; influenced politicians of both parties, 310, 311, 316, 318; grants to his railroads opposed by the *Republican*, 310, 311, 312; sued the *Republican* for libel (1873–75), 312, 315, 334; was given damages of $100, appealed, but never brought case to trial, 317, 318; upshot of suit, 346, 371.

Philadelphia, chosen as a home by Benjamin Franklin, **1**: 6; **2**: 77; its lack of theaters a trial to Franklin, 77; National Council of the Americans (Know-nothings), nominating Fillmore (1856), **1**: 149, 165; 1st Republican National Convention, nominating Fremont (1856), 150, 151; convention of delegates from the North and South to organize a "Conservative party" to support Pres. Johnson (1866), **2**: 24, 25; Episcopal charities in, 164; Republican National Convention, renominating Grant (1872), 189, 190, 195; reported by Bowles, 195; Bowles's liking for the city, **1**: 165; his plan of publishing a newspaper in (1856–7), 177, 178, 290; visits by Bowles to, 149, 151, 165, 166; **2**: 195, 345, 428.

Philips, Stephen C., of Massachusetts; on committee to organize a new political party (1855), **1**: 140.

Phillips, Wendell, of Boston, Mass.; a leader of the Abolition party **1**: 87; denounced the Union for recognizing Slavery (1844), 87, 154; promoted Abolitionist meetings, 88; offended moderate people, 111, 390; summoned the people to resist rendition of Anthony Burns to Slavery, Boston (1854), 119; opposed Fremont, Republican candidate for President, because he regarded the U. S. Constitution (1856), 154, 155; denounced by Pres. Johnson as attempting a counter-revolution in behalf of the freedmen (1865), **2**: 22; his eulogy by Geo. Wm. Curtis, 384.

Pierce, Franklin, of New Hampshire, President of the United States (1853–7); Democratic candidate for President (1852), **1**: 95; elected President over Scott (Whig) and Hale (Free-soil), 95; favored repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the extension of Slavery into Kansas and Nebraska, 112, 118, 130, 146; appointed Kansas territorial government in the interest of Slavery, 130, 131, 146, 148, 149, 152, 224; subservient to the Slavery interest, 265; his Cabinet, 130; his political obscurity and feeble character, 95, 130; discarded for renomination in favor of Buchanan (1856), 149.

Pierce, Henry L., Republican, M. C. from Massachusetts; opposed the Force Bill (1875), **2**: 239; opposed Sherman's bill for resuming specie payment (1874), 242; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; delegate to National Republican Convention, Cincinnati (1876), 275; took the stump against Butler for Congress (1876), 275; voted independently of party in Hayes-Tilden disputed election case in the House, 298, 299.

Pierce, Surveyor-General John, of Denver, Colorado; letters from Samuel Bowles (1866), **2**: 49; *in* 1867, 54, 55; *in* 1872, 208, 215; wrote for the *Republican* (1866), 50, 54; visit from Mr. and Mrs. Bowles (1871), 174.

Pierrepont, Edwards, Attorney-General in Pres. Grant's Cabinet, **2**: 248; refused military aid to Mississippi Carpet-bag government (1875), 249.

Pike's Peak, Bowles's impressions of, **2**: 3.

Pilsbury, Parker, of Massachusetts, Abolition Disunionist; opposed Fremont's election as President (1856), **1**: 154.

Pittsburg, Penn.; Bowles's description of the manufactures of (1866), **2**: 52.

Poland, Luke P., M. C. from Vermont; chairman of House Committee to investigate Credit Mobilier scandal (1873), **2**: 225; opposed the Force Bill (1875), 238, 239; opposed the Administration Bill repudiating the Arkansas state government (1875), 240.

Polk, James K., of Tennessee, President of the United States (1845–9); Democratic candidate for President, against Clay (1844), **1**: 46; elected by defection of the "Liberty party" from Clay to Birney, 46; his election occasioned the annexation of Texas (1845), 46; brought about war with Mexico, 47.

Polygamy [*see* Utah].

Pomeroy, Col. Robert, letter from Bowles (1876), **2**: 353.

Pomeroy, Samuel C., U. S. Senator, **2**: 56.

Pomeroy, Wm. M., managing editor of the *Republican*, **1**: 387, 389, 401, 407; **2**: 68, 146, 205; owned shares in the *Republican*, **2**: 201; partnership dissolved by Bowles (1872), 203, 206; engaged in rival newspaper, the Springfield *Union* (1872), 204–209; urged Bowles's nomination for Mayor of Springfield (1873), 332.

"Pone," Bowles's horse, **1**: 327, 330, 396, 405; **2**: 77, 327; sold; unexpectedly proved a racer; died on the race-course, **2**: 327, 328.

"Popular Sovereignty," political phrase of S. A. Douglas (*q. v.*), **1**: 115.

Port Hudson, taking of, **1**: 343.

Portland, Oregon, Mr. and Mrs. Bowles visited (1869), **2**: 147.

Potter, Clarkson N., Democratic M. C. from New York; on committee to visit Louisiana and investigate political troubles (1875), **2**: 236; reported in condemnation of Gov. Kellogg's government, 236, 237.

Prentice, George D., Whig, editor of the *Journal*, Louisville, Ky.; influential in withholding Kentucky from Secession, **2**: 134.

"Primary meetings," or **"primaries,"** in American politics, **2**: 270, *n.*

Puget Sound, Bowles's visit and impressions (1865), **2**: 13.

Pugh, George E., U. S. Senator from Ohio; supported S. A. Douglas's Popular Sovereignty doctrine (1859), **1**: 257.

Pulsifer, R. M., publisher of the Boston *Herald*, **2**: 337; in Washington, etc. (1874), 337.

Punch, London; pictures of English life, **1**: 364.

Quakers, their social influence in Pennsylvania, **1**: 10.

Ralston, William C., President of the Bank of California, San Francisco; his business enterprises, **2**: 388; death (Aug. 27, 1875), 388; characterization by Bowles, 388.

Randall, Samuel J., M. C. from Pennsylvania; Democratic leader in the House, **2**: 239; opposed the Force Bill (1875), 239; Speaker of the House (1875), 249; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 284.

Ransom, Matthew W., Democrat, U. S. Senator from North Carolina; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), **2**: 288.

Rantoul, Robert, of Massachusetts; left Democratic for Free-soil party (1848), **1**: 54; elected by the Democrats to the U. S. Senate (1850), 92.

Raymond, Henry J., of New York; founded the N. Y. *Times*, **1**: 29; sacrificed editorial power by office-seeking, 67; political sagacity, 191; meeting with Bowles in Washington (1868), **2**: 56; foresaw increased cost of publishing newspapers, 335; combined news-gathering with political leadership, 442.

Raynor, Kenneth, political influence in North Carolina, **1**: 228.

Reeder, A. H., appointed Governor of Kansas by Pres. Pierce, as a Democrat (1854), **1**: 130; opposed the pro-Slavery Legislature, and was recalled, 130, 152.

Reform, Reformers, etc. [*see* Civil Service].

Reid, Whitelaw, editor of the N. Y. *Tribune*, **2**: 151, 184; professed "independence" in journalism, 184; attended Liberal Republican National Convention (1872), 184, 187.

Republican [*see* Springfield Republican].

Rice, Alexander H., of Boston, Mass.; opposed B. F. Butler's nomination for Governor (1871), **2**: 108; elected Governor by the Republicans (1875), 273, 274; renominated (1876); elected, 275, 423.

Rice, Rev. Dr. Wm., of Springfield; member of "The Club," **2**: 76; officiated at Bowles's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441.

Richardson, Albert D., writer for New York *Tribune* on the tour "Across the Continent" (1865), **2**: 1.

Richardson, William A., of Massachusetts; Secretary of the Treasury in Grant's Cabinet, **2**: 232; succeeded by B. F. Bristow (1874), 232.

Richardson, William A., M. C. from Illinois; supported Douglas's "Popular Sovereignty" theory, **1**: 116.

Richmond, Va., Grant's siege and capture of, **1**: 414.

Richmond *Whig*, exultant at the hanging of John Brown (1859), **1**: 253.

Ripley, F. R., of Mass.; death (1860), **1**: 303.

Ripley, Major, James W., Supt. U. S. Armory, Springfield, **1**: 24.

Robeson, George M., of New Jersey; Secretary of the Navy in Grant's Cabinet (1868), **2**: 113, 252; extravagant administration of naval affairs, 113, 252.

Rocky Mountains, Bowles's impressions of, **2**: 4.

Robinson, George D., of Chicopee, Mass.; involved with the machine managers, **2**: 276, 431; legislative experience, 276; nominated for Congress by the Republicans (1876); elected, 276, 277, 430; letter from Bowles (1877), 430; commended by Bowles to Washington friends, 431.

Robinson, William S. ("Warrington"), Boston correspondent of the *Republican*, **1**: 195, 388; his attacks on the New York *Nation*, 93, 168; prepared platform of Massachusetts Radical State Convention (1866), **2**: 26; not hostile to B. F. Butler (1868), 93; opposed Butler's nomination for Governor (1871), 108; supported Liberal Republican movement (1872), 179; death (1876), 350, 426; memoir by Mrs. Robinson, 426.

Rockwell, Julius, of Pittsfield, Mass.; named as Whig candidate for Governor (1854), **1**: 122; nominated by Republicans, and declined Whig nomination (1855), 143, 169; defeated by Gardner, American, 144.

Ross, Edmund G., U. S. Senator; voted to acquit Pres. Johnson, impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 37.

Roxbury, Mass.; John Bowles (I.) a resident of, and founder of its free-school, **1**: 1; John Bowles (II.) its representative in the General Court, 1; John

Bowles (Ill.) connected with the town government, 2; furnished colony which settled Springfield, Mass. (1636), 13.

Runkle, Mrs. (formerly Mrs. L. G. Calhoun); editorial writer for N. Y. *Tribune*, **2**: 153; visited at Mr. Bowles's house (1869), 153–155; Mrs. Bowles at her house (1871), 167; Mr. Bowles at her house (1871), 170, 347; letters from Bowles, 217, 336, 346.

Salt Lake City, Utah; Bowles's visit to (1865) **2**: 5.

Sanborn, Frank B., of Concord, Mass.; promoted John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry (1859), **1**: 250; a writer for the *Republican*, 250, 389; **2**: 68, 146, 158, 422; editor of the Boston *Commonwealth*, **1**: 390, 415; **2**: 214; letters from Bowles (1863), **1**: 390; (1873), **2**: 335, 350; his attacks on the N. Y. *Nation*, 168; writings on charities, reforms, etc., 422.

San Domingo, Republic of; its annexation favored by Pres. Grant (1870, '71), **2**: 127, 130; resented by Hayti, 128; opposed by Senator Sumner, 128, 130; a commission, sent to visit the island, report favorably (1871), 130.

San Francisco, Cal.; remote from Eastern States until Pacific railroads were built, **2**: 2; Bowles's impressions of (1865), 4, 6–9, 11, 14; his criticisms resented, 8, 47, 50; Bowles and Mrs. B. visited (1869), 145; Bank of California, 47, 387–389.

San Francisco *Bulletin*, approved Bowles's book, *Across the Continent* (1866), **2**: 51.

San Francisco *News-Letter*, attacked Bowles's view of California, in his *Across the Continent* (1866), **2**: 51.

San Francisco *Union*, approved Bowles's book, *Across the Continent* (1866), **2**: 51.

Schenck, Gen. Robert C., M. C. from Ohio; supported economy in administration (1870), **2**: 118; appointed Minister to England (1871), 121; member of Joint Commission on *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), 121.

Schermerhorn, H. V. R., of Geneva, N. Y., father-in-law of Samuel Bowles, **1**: 56.

Schermerhorn, Mary S. D., of Geneva, N. Y.; left motherless in childhood, **1**: 57; a schoolmate of Samuel Bowles in Springfield, 56; married to him at Geneva, N. Y. (Sept. 6, 1848), 56 [*further entries under* Bowles, Mary S. D.]

Schofield, Gen. John M., made Secretary of War in Johnson's Cabinet, *vice* Stanton (1868), **2**: 38.

Schurz, Carl, U. S. Senator from Missouri; in National Republican Convention carried resolution of conciliation toward rebels now become loyal (1868), **2**: 40; opposed deposition of Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Relations by the Grant cabal (1871), 130; opposed the policy of the Grant Administration, 131, 194; with B. Gratz Brown, led a State Convention in Missouri, inaugurating the Liberal Republican movement (Jan., 1872), 177; presided at the Liberal Republican National Convention, Cincinnati (1872), favoring C. F. Adams's nomination for President, 185, 186, 210; slow to support Greeley for President, 189; spoke in the campaign, denouncing the corruptions of Grant's Administration, 194; favored the support by the Administration of the Kellogg government in Louisiana (1873), 234; anxious for Southern reconstruction (1874), 335; criticised Sherman's Resumption Bill, but voted for it (1875), 241, 242; stumped Ohio, supporting R. B. Hayes for Governor, and opposing inflation of the currency (1875), 244; attended Reform Conference, New York, and prepared address there adopted, etc. (April, 1876), 254; in Presidential campaign (1876), supported Hayes's platform of reform and Southern reconciliation, 278, 281; made Secretary of the Interior in Pres. Hayes's Cabinet (1877), 304, 420; his story of Lincoln's reconcilement of Sumner (1865), **1**: 419, *n.*; his estimate of Grant's ignorance of Republican methods of government, **2**: 111; his comprehension of the American political theory, judged by C. F. Adams, 131; meetings with Bowles, **2**: 170, 345; letters from Bowles, 420, 423; wrote letter read at Bowles's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 422.

Schuyler, Miss Louisa Lee, letter from Bowles on local charities and reforms (1877), **2**: 422.

Scott, Dred, a slave in Missouri, **1**: 220; claim that he was freed by residing in free states, 220; claim denied by Chief-justice Taney and a majority of the U. S. Supreme Court (1857), 116, 220–224, 238, 240, 242, 246; manumitted, 220, *n.*

Scott, Thomas A., of Philadelphia, Pa., Pres. Union Pacific R. R.; opposed to Sec. B. F. Bristow, **2**: 253; favored J. G. Blaine for President, 254; testimony in Congressional investigation of Blaine's railroad speculations, 256.

Scott, Gen. Winfield, in the war with Mexico (1846–8), **1**: 47, 48; nominated for President by the Whigs (1852), 94; defeated by Pierce, 95.

Scribner's Monthly (later *The Century Magazine*), New York; Dr. J. G. Holland's connection with, **1**: 202.

Seaton (Gales & Seaton), editor of *The National Intelligencer*, **1**: 26.

Seeley, Rev. R. H., member of "The Club," Springfield, **2**: 76.

Seelye, Prof. Julius H., of Amherst, Mass.; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), **2**: 254; anti-Caucus candidate for Congress (1874); elected, 271, 272; protested in the House against partisan decision of the Hayes-Tilden disputed election case (1876), 299.

Seward, William H., of New York; leader of the Whig party in New York, **1**: 46, [52, 117, 262
associated in political management with Thurlow Weed, **1**: 117, 262, 302
—— —— Horace Greeley, **1**: 52; **2**: 183
subsequently opposed by Greeley, **1**: 262, 263
statesmanlike methods in politics, **1**: 190; **2**: 451
hostile to Slavery, **1**: 55
doubtful of Henry Clay's policy as to Slavery (1844), **1**: 46
supported Gen. Taylor against Cass (Dem.) and Van Buren (Free-soil), for President
U. S. Senator from New York (1848), **1**: 55 [(1848), **1**: 52
antagonism to Pres. Fillmore, **1**: 79
led opposition, in the Senate, to extension of Slavery, **1**: 116
organized New York Whigs on anti-Nebraska basis (1854), **1**: 117
proposed for Republican nomination for President (1856), **1**: 172
denounced the U. S. Supreme Court's decision in the Dred Scott fugitive slave case
[(1858), **1**: 223
declared the "irrepressible conflict" between Slavery and freedom (1858), **1**: 243
disclaimed extra-Constitutional opposition to Slavery (1858), **1**: 243
disunion threatened by Southern leaders, if he were elected President (1859), **1**: 257
candidate for Republican nomination for President, Chicago National Convention,
disbelieved in Secession, **1**: 269 [1860; defeated by Lincoln, **1**: 262, 263, 301, 303
urged conciliation (1861), **1**: 277, 278, 279, 283, 286, 287
proposed building two Pacific railroads, **1**: 279
influence in Republican party, **1**: 281, 301, 318
Secretary of State in Lincoln's Cabinet, **1**: 282, 318
opposed holding Fort Sumter, **1**: 286
influence with Lincoln, **1**: 346
his foreign diplomacy, **1**: 346
his conservative policy, **1**: 391
remained in Pres. Johnson's Cabinet, **2**: 22.

Seymour, Horatio, of New York; Democrat; elected Governor of New York (1862), **1**: 356; nominated for President (1868); defeated by Grant, **2**: 41–43.

Shadrach, a fugitive slave, liberated in Boston (1851), **1**: 86, 89.

Shannon, Wilson, appointed Democratic Governor of Kansas by Pres. Pierce (1855), **1**: 130; supported usurping pro-Slavery Legislature, 130; wavered between political parties, 152; removed for scandals of his administration (1856), 152, 153.

Shaw-Lefèvre, in British House of Commons, favored amicable arbitration of the *Alabama* claims (1868), **2**: 120.

Shearman, Thomas G., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; law partner of David Dudley Field *(q. v.)*, **2**: 101.

Shepherd, Alexander, **2**: 232; nominated Commissioner of the District of Columbia by Pres. Grant; rejected by the Senate (1874), 232.

Sheridan, Philip H., Gen. U. S. Army; his services in the final campaign in Virginia (1864), **1**: 414; as commander in Louisiana, supported Gov. Kellogg in expelling Democratic members of the Legislature (1874), **2**: 235; assured by Secretary Belknap of the approval of Pres. Grant's Administration, 235; the course of the Administration denounced at the North and in Congress, and referred by Grant to Congress [*see* LOUISIANA], 235, 236.

Sherman, John, M. C. from Ohio; Republican candidate for Speaker of the House; defeated (1859), **1**: 256, 257; attacked for approving Helper's "Impending Crisis" (1859), 256; partisanship on sectional questions, **2**: 243, 304; influence with Grant's Administration, 115; opposed Grant's deposition of Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), 130; chairman of Senate Finance Committee (1875), 240; his bill for resuming specie payments (1875), 240–243; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 284; reported in vindication of the Returning Board, 287; opposed the bill creating the Electoral Commission, 294; Secretary of the Treasury in Pres. Hayes's Cabinet (1877), 243, 304.

Sherman, Gen. W. T., U. S. A.; his march to the sea (1864), **1**: 343, 413.

Shipley, Joseph H., night-editor of the *Republican*, **1**: 388, 389.

Shurtleff, Judge Wm. S., of Springfield; drew up new City Charter for Springfield (1876), **2**: 323; assisted by BOWLES, 323.

Simmons, Rev. George, dismissed from pastorate of Unitarian church, Springfield, for maintaining free speech, **1**: 96.
Simmons, William F., of Massachusetts; a political "worker" for B. F. Butler, **2**: 265, 266, 342; member of the Republican State Central Committee (1873), 265; made Collector of Boston by Pres. Grant (1873), against protest, 266.
Simms, Thomas, remanded to slavery from Boston (April, 1851), **1**: 86, 119
Slang — Political names, phrases, etc.: American party, **1**: 124; Barn-burners, 52; Carpet-bag-baggers, etc., **2**: 126; Caucus, 270; Contraband, name for negroes, from General Butler's declaring them "Contraband of war," 91; Filibuster, 301; Higher law (as to Slavery), **1**: 116; Irrepressible conflict (between Freedom and Slavery), 243; Know-nothings, **1**: 123; Know-somethings, 140; Kuklux, **2**: 125: Machine, 270, *n.*; Popular, or Squatter Sovereignty, **1**: 115, 150; "Republican" selected as name for the new party (1854), 117; Tammany Hall, **2**: 136, 137.
Slidell, seized on the British ship *Trent* (1861), **1**: 332.
Smalley, George W., London correspondent of the N. Y. *Tribune*, **2**: 163; meetings with Bowles in England (1874), 313, 340, 341, 344; letters from Bowles, *in* 1874, 335, 343; *in* 1877, 354, 424.
Smith, Caleb B., of Indiana; promised Cabinet office if he secured Lincoln's nomination by Republican National Convention (1860), **1**: 263; made Secretary of Interior in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), 282.
Smith, Dr. David P., of Springfield; medical treatment of Bowles, **1**: 308, 351; **2**: 428; member of "The Club," 76; excursions with Bowles in Massachusetts, 79; with Bowles in London and Paris (1874), 313, 339, 340; with Bowles in his last illness (1877), 428, 434, 435, 436; attended Bowles's granddaughter (1871), 330; attended Bowles's son-in-law (1876), 351, 352.
Smith, Gerrit, M. C. from New York; opposed territorial extension of Slavery (1854), **1**: 116.
Soule, Judge Augustus L., of Springfield; member of "The Club," **2**: 76; named by the *Republican* for Republican nomination for Congress (1873), 268.

South Carolina, aristocratic influences in its early political development, **1**: 10; **2**: [124
prepared to secede after Lincoln's election (Nov., 1860), **1**: 269, 273
her Federal officers, Congressmen, etc., resigned, **1**: 273
Convention called by Legislature, elected, declared Secession (Dec., 1860), **1**: 273; [**2**: 305
joined the Southern Confederacy (1861), **1**: 274
problem of the national forts, customs duties, etc., **1**: 275, 277, 281, 287
prepared for war; attacked Fort Sumter (April 12); opened the War, **1**: 275, 278, 288
freedom to slaves of rebels proclaimed by Gen. Hunter, but withheld by Pres. Lincoln, [**1**: 352
voted for Grant for President (1868), **2**: 43
the negro problem, **2**: 124
carpet-bag misrule, supported by the Grant Administration, **2**: 124, 126, 195, 279
terrorism, Kuklux, etc., **2**: 124, 126, 279
Republican majority reduced, in state election (1874), **2**: 233
violence by Democrats during state and Presidential election, repressed by U. S. [troops (1876), **2**: 279, 282, 289, 302
Gov. D. H. Chamberlain (Rep.) candidate for reëlection, opposed by Wade Hamp- [ton (Dem.), **2**: 279
vote for President disputed, **2**: 283, 285, 288
Returning Board declared for Hayes, Supreme Court for Tilden, **2**: 285, 286, 288, 289
Returning Board excluded 8 Democratic members of the Legislature, using Federal troops; Democrats seceded and organized rival Legislature, which declared Hampton Governor, **2**: 289
attempt to bribe a Republican Presidential elector to vote for Tilden, **2**: 290
Electoral Commission gave vote of the state to Hayes, **2**: 299
Hayes promised to withdraw troops and cease Federal interference, **2**: 302
troops withdrawn by Pres. Hayes; collapse of the Chamberlain Carpet-bag government; Hampton Governor (1877), **2**. 305.
Southern Confederacy *(officially,* the Confederate States of America)
formed by South Carolina's Secession, followed by Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Jefferson Davis made President, **1**: 274 [Alabama, Louisiana (1861), **1**: 274
seized national forts, navy-yards, etc.; prepared for war, **1**: 274, 275
attempted compromises or peaceful separation, **1**: 275–288
precipitated war by the attack on Fort Sumter, April 12, 1861 [*see* War], **1**: 288
joined by Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, Texas, **1**: 288
course of the War *(q. v.)*, **1**: 341–363
English sympathy with, **2**: 119
report spread that its debts would be assumed by the United States if Tilden were [elected President (1872), **2**: 280.
Speed, J. F., of Kentucky; letter from Abraham Lincoln to (1855), **1**: 237.

Spofford, Mrs. Harriet Prescott, **2**: 170.
Spofford, Henry M., Democrat, of Louisiana; elected by both parties to U. S. Senate (1877), **2**: 305, 420, 429; favorable personal impression on BOWLES, 420; letters from BOWLES, 428, 429.
Sprague, Seth, of Massachusetts; delegate to Whig National Convention (1852), **1**: 93.
Sprague, Wm., Republican, U. S. Senator from Rhode Island; opposed Sherman's bill for resuming specie payments (1874), **2**: 241.
Springer, William M., Democrat, M. C. from Illinois; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), **2**: 288.
Springfield, Mass. [*see also* MASSACHUSETTS, SAMUEL BOWLES (III.), *and the newspapers whose titles follow*]; its situation and surroundings, **1**: 1, 3, 14, 366; **2**: 57, 142, 323; early history and social conditions, **1**: 13, 16, 17, 100; growth, 33, 34, 179, 206; **2**: 308, 309; railroad connections, 13, 21, 34; provincial censoriousness, 77, 322; the scene of Dr. J. G. Holland's novel, *The Bay Path*, **1**: 100; residence of the Bowles family in, 1, 4; **2**: 142; its churches, **1**: 11, 96; Unitarian Church, attended by the Bowles family, 11, 12; Unitarian Church of the Unity, **2**: 323; United States armory, **1**: 13, 23, 24, 180; schools, 16; **2**: 323; "The Club," 76; city library, 323; Union Relief Society, 325, 326; excitement upon George Thompson's Abolition meetings (1851), **1**: 87–90, 96; Unitarian Church dismissed its pastor for maintaining free speech on the Abolition question (1851), 96; Know-nothing council held (1855), 140; demonstrations on the execution of John Brown (1859), 254; nomination for Mayor offered to BOWLES (*q. v.*), but declined (1873), **2**: 308; city elections carried by a ring of railroad jobbers, who extorted subscriptions to their stock (1873–4), 310–312, 317, 318; amendment of the city charter, defeated by party "bosses" (1877), 323.
Springfield *Argus*, Democratic campaign paper (1857), **1**: 386.
Springfield *Evening Gazette*, established in opposition to the *Republican* (1846), **1**: 23, 24; absorbed by the *Republican* (1848), 25.
Springfield *Evening Union*, established 1864, **1**: 386; bought by BOWLES's former partners (Clark W. Bryan & Co.), as a rival to the *Republican* (1872), **2**: 204–209; supported Grant for President, while the *Republican* supported Greeley, 205; once "noticed" by the *Republican*, then ignored, 207, 208; attacked the *Republican* and BOWLES, 208; proved unprofitable, 208; nominated BOWLES for Mayor of Springfield (1873), 309, 332, 335.

Springfield *Republican*, established as a weekly paper by Samuel Bowles (II.) (1824), its early condition, **1**: 4, 20, 30, 31 [**1**: 4
its "leaders" written out of the office, **1**: 20, 32, 35, 45
altered to a daily evening paper by the persuasion of SAMUEL BOWLES (III.) *(q. v.)* [(March 27, 1844), **1**: 21, 23
its appearance, size, "make up," and scope *in* 1844, **1**: 21, 30, 31
—— —— —— *in* BOWLES's later years, **2**: 357–403
the daily paper originally edited by SAMUEL BOWLES, unassisted, **1**: 21, 23, 32
always inspired by him, **2**: 357, 443
published letters from the South by BOWLES (1844–5), **1**: 22, 50
made a morning paper (Dec., 1845), **1**: 23
gave special attention to local news, **1**: 23, 33, 64, 65, 99–103; **2**: 358
—— to Massachusetts affairs, **1**: 100; **2**: 358
—— —— elections, **1**: 24
—— to "Public Opinion," **1**: 114
introduced brief editorial paragraphs, instead of the heavy "leaders" of the political [journals, **1**: 23, 64, 199; **2**: 358
its news and comment condensed, but comprehensive and thorough, **1**: 23, 30, 61, 97–[101; **2**: 358, 359, 374, 376
introduction of the telegraph (May 22, 1844), **1**: 26, 29, 64, 98
telegraphic dispatches to the *Republican* (1846), **1**: 98, 193
method of giving war news (1861–65), **1**: 347
a social and moral instructor, **1**: 61, 200–202; **2**: 59, 367–374, 402
a critic of institutions, events, and persons of public interest, **1**: 203, 213–216, 411
a leader of opinion, **2**: 379, 380
its attention to literature, science, etc., **1**: 62, 200; **2**: 59, 359, 375, 393
—— religious interests, **1**: 64, 108, 401; **2**: 366, 382, 394–403
—— social progress and morality, **2**: 375, 389–393, 457
—— Massachusetts and New England history, **1**: 100; **2**: 375
—— national growth, **2**: 386–389
—— public education, **1**: 160; **2**: 79
—— public charities and social reforms, **2**: 375, 422

Springfield *Republican.—Continued.*
favored an educational test for voters, **2**: 19, 20, 31, 44, 45
claimed largest circulation in New England, outside of Boston (May 8, 1850), **1**: 65
enlarged its Saturday paper to eight pages, printed with new presses, type, etc., and [recounted its previous history (Feb. 3, 1855), **1**: 193
recognized as the best provincial journal in America (1856), **1**: 179; **2**: 326
its circulation, income, influence, etc. (1860), **1**: 179, 180, 394, *n*
growth stimulated by the War (1861–5), **1**: 347, 386
injured by dissolution of partnership, establishment of the *Union* by Bowles's former [partners, and the financial panic (1872), **2**: 205–209, 307
its business management, editorial staff, etc., reorganized, **2**: 307, 308, 332
Samuel Bowles, Jr. (IV.), initiated in the management (1872), **2**: 308
its business depressed by the hard times of 1873, **2**: 313, 335
—— retrieved in 1877, **2**: 416
its future management prescribed by Bowles on his death-bed (1877), **2**: 439
its ownership, departments, etc.:
—— one-half interest given to Samuel Bowles, in consideration of his buying [the publication office, **1**: 57
—— one-quarter interest sold to Dr. J. G. Holland (1853), **1**: 58, 61
—— job-printing office, bindery, etc., **1**: 103, 104, 387, 408; **2**: 307
—— condition of Samuel Bowles & Co. *in* 1872, **2**: 201
—— firm dissolved by Bowles (1872), **2**: 201–204, 307
—— exclusion of B. F. Bowles *(q. v.)* from the management (1875), **2**: 319, 320
its controversies, exposures of rings, jobs, etc., **1**: 386; **2**: 90, 137, 316, 318, 319
—— management of the Springfield Armory (1846), **1**: 23–25 [370–373
—— George Thompson's abolition agitation in Springfield (1851), **1**:
—— B. F. Butler *(q. v.)* (1868, *and after*), **2**: 93, 106–108 [87, 90
—— the Erie Ring, Jas. Fisk, Jr.; D. D. Field, etc. (1868), **2**: 93–101, [168
—— Pacific Railroad Ring, Credit Mobilier, etc. (1868), **2**: 101, 102,
—— railroad jobs in Massachusetts, **2**: 102–105 [217–219, 228
—— Willis Phelps's railroad grants from the city of Springfield (1873), **2**: 310–313
its libel suits, **2**: 371, 372
—— James Fisk, Jr. *(q. v.)* (1868), **2**: 94, 96
—— Willis Phelps *(q. v.)* (1873–75), **2**: 310–312, 315–319, 346, 371
its rivals, **1**: 23, 25, 30
—— Springfield *Evening Gazette (q. v.)* (1846–48), **1**: 23–25
—— —— *Argus* (1857), **1**: 386
—— —— *Evening Union* (1864), **1**: 386; **2**: 204
—— —— *Union* bought by Bowles's former partners, and conducted in [opposition to the *Republican* (1872), **2**: 204–209, 307
—— habitually ignored by the *Republican*, **1**: 24, 386; **2**: 207, 208
its politics [*see also* Samuel Bowles (III.)], always vigorously discussed, **1**: 45, 64
—— opposed annexation of Texas by the Tyler Administration, in its first edi- [torial article (April 24, 1844), **1**: 26, 45, 46
—— opposed War with Mexico (1844), **1**: 45, 47
—— —— territorial extension of Slavery, **1**: 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 53, 76, 69,
—— —— Fugitive Slave Law, **1**: 79, 114 [118
—— supported the Whig party, **1**: 45, 46, 54, 64, 69, 73, 80, 82, 91–95, 118, [192, 193
—— favored Henry Clay's nomination for President (1844–48), **1**: 44, 51
—— supported Taylor for President against Van Buren (1848), **1**: 54, 55
—— opposed the Abolitionists, **1**: 49, 50, 85–90, 92, 154
—— supported Webster and his policy as to Slavery, **1**: 78–81, 85, 96; **2**: 17
—— supported Whigs against Democratic and Free-soil coalition in Massa- [chusetts elections (1850–1), **1**: 90, 93
—— opposed Charles Sumner's first election to U. S. Senate (1851), **1**: 92
—— favored high tariff (1851), **1**: 93
—— supported Scott (Whig) against Pierce (Dem.) for President (1852), **1**:
—— opposed repeal of the Missouri Compromise (1853), **1**: 112 [94, 95
—— —— extension of Slavery into Kansas and Nebraska (1853), **1**: 114– [121, 135, 141, 145, 150, 155, 156, 158, 222–231
—— —— the Pierce Administration, **1**: 118, 143, 148
—— favored colonizing the territories with anti-Slavery settlers (1854), **1**: 116,
—— opposed return of fugitive Slaves (1854), **1**: 119, 120, 133 [136
—— urged political union of all opponents of Slavery, **1**: 121
—— disgusted with the Whigs, **1**: 121, 122, 126, 139, 143, 174

Springfield *Republican.—Continued.*
its politics: opposed the new Know-nothing party (1854–55), **1**: 124–127, 139, 144,
—— declared its independence of party (Feb. 3, 1855), **1**: 193 [159, 169, 170
—— —— adhesion to the "higher law" concerning Slavery" (1855), **1**:
—— opposed Personal Liberty acts, as unconstitutional, **1**: 134, 135 [133
—— supported Senator Wilson's anti-Slavery course, **1**: 136–139
—— —— anti-Slavery wing of Know-nothing party, in bolting the Slav-
[ery-extension platform of National Convention (1855), **1**: 137–139
—— called for formation of an anti-Slavery party (1855), **1**: 139, 141, 168
—— supported Republican party (1855), **1**: 140, 142, 144, 169
—— rebuked Brooks's assault upon Sumner and ruffianly political methods of
[Southern politicians (1856), **1**: 148
—— supported Fremont (Rep.) for President (1856), **1**: 151–160, 172
—— —— Republicans against coalition of all pro-Slavery parties in
[Massachusetts, **1**: 154–160
—— made light of Southern threats of disunion, **1**: 155
—— opposed Gardner's nomination for Governor of Massachusetts, **1**: 155, 175
—— supported H. L. Dawes (Rep.) for Congress, **1**: 156, 157, 160
—— attacked the U. S. Supreme Court for its decision in the Dred Scott case
[(1857), **1**: 222, 223
—— declared Pres. Buchanan's policy of forcing Slavery upon Kansas likely to
[result in civil war (Feb. 8, 1858), **1**: 227
—— opposed the Buchanan Administration, **1**: 228–231, 244, 278
—— supported S. A. Douglas (Dem.), as hostile to the Administration (1858),
[**1**: 232, 233
—— supported N. P. Banks (Rep.) for reëlection as Governor of Massachu-
[setts (1858), **1**: 243, 244
—— opposed Douglas as a demagogue (1860), **1**: 234, 240
—— considered John Brown a fanatic, but a hero, and protested against his
[execution (1859), **1**: 251–254
—— derided the notion of disunion, **1**: 258, 264–268
—— was excluded from the mails in the South, **1**: 258
—— praised Douglas's stand against pro-Slavery encroachment in Democratic
[National Convention (1860), **1**: 262
—— favored nomination of Banks for President by Republicans (1860), **1**: 263
—— supported Lincoln for President, though not liking him, **1**: 267, 281
—— derided nomination of Bell (Constitutional Union) for President, **1**: 264
—— favored nomination of Dawes (Rep.) for Governor of Massachusetts, but
[supported Andrew when nominated, **1**: 266, 267
—— willing to repeal the Personal Liberty Law, as a means of averting Seces-
[sion, **2**: 275, 276
—— opposed restoration of the Missouri Compromise line, **1**: 276
—— denounced Buchanan's feeble deprecation of rebellion, **1**: 278
—— demanded maintenance of the Union, and enforcement of the laws, when
[Fort Sumter was threatened (Jan. 12, 1861), **1**: 278
—— favored concessions to the South, and censured warlike preparations by
[Gov. Andrew and Massachusetts Legislature, **1**: 283, 287
—— consistent in supporting war measures of Lincoln's Administration (1861–
[65), **1**: 349, 352, 354, 358, 360, 362, 363
—— gradually came to favor destruction of Slavery as a war measure, **1**: 350–
[355, 362, 363
—— urged obliteration of party lines during the War (1861), **1**: 355, 356
—— supported Gov. Andrew for reëlection (1861), **1**: 356
—— opposed ascendency in the Republican party of Sumner and the Radicals
[(Bowles being in Europe) (1862), **1**: 357, 358, 359
—— supported Gov. Andrew's reëlection (1863, '64), **1**: 359, 361
—— favored Lincoln's reëlection as President (1864), **1**: 360
—— supported Lincoln's Reconstruction policy (1865), **2**: 19
—— anxious to support Pres. Johnson and compose discords (1865), **2**: 20–25
—— careful for rights of the Freedmen, **2**: 22, 23, 24, 26, 282
—— opposed the Radical wing of Republican party in Congress, **2**: 22, 23, 26,
[27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 91, 125, 127
—— urged coöperation of the South in Reconstruction, **2**: 23, 25, 27, 32, 135,
[207
—— —— liberal treatment of the South, **2**: 29, 30, 31, 34, 40, 44, 125, 238–240
—— censured Johnson's veto of Civil Rights Bill (1866), **2**: 24
—— disgusted by his violence and forced to oppose him, **2**: 26, 33, 35

Springfield *Republican.—Continued.*
its politics: favored Pres. Johnson's impeachment (1868), **2**: 35–37
—— favored Gen. Grant's nomination for President by the Republicans, and [supported him in the canvass (1868), **2**: 39, 115
—— forced into opposition by the corruptions and abuses of the Grant Administration [*see* GRANT], **2**: 89, 116, 118, 129, 133–137, 179, 332
—— —— by its support of carpet-baggism and usurpation of powers in [the South, **2**: 127, 179, 234–240, 248
—— —— —— by its partisan ring in Congress, **2**: 127–129
—— opposed Grant's renomination (1871–2), **2**: 134, 178
—— a leader in the Liberal Republican movement, **2**: 178–181
—— favored nomination for President of C. F. Adams *(q. v.)*, **2**: 180, 186, 189
—— reluctantly supported Greeley *(q. v.)* for President, **2**: 187–199
—— its course unpopular at home, **2**: 192, 205–207
—— supported Dawes for the U. S. Senate, *vice* Sumner (1873), **2**: 266, 331
—— supported C. W. Chapin *(q. v.)* for Congress, against H. Alexander, Jr. [*(q. v.)* (1873), **2**: 268, 269, 272, 275, 314
—— antagonized the "Machine" (1873), **2**: 270, 273, 331, 351
—— favored Dawes or Adams for U. S. Senator (1874), **2**: 273
—— praised Grant's veto of the Currency Inflation Bill (1874), **2**: 230
—— opposed Grant's nomination for a third term (1875), **2**: 238
—— opposed Senator Sherman's Specie Resumption Bill, **2**: 240–242
—— approved Bristow's administration of the Treasury Department and suppression of frauds, **2**: 240, 243, 253
—— opposed Democratic advocacy of currency inflation in Ohio campaign, [**2**: 244
—— rebuked partisanship of *Harper's Weekly* and New York Republicans in belittling Gov. Tilden's reform measures (1875), **2**: 247
—— welcomed Conservative election victories in the South (1875), **2**: 249
—— censured appointment of "Zach" Chandler as Secretary of the Interior, [**2**: 252
—— favored nomination of Bristow for President (1876), **2**: 253, 260
—— supported Hayes, when nominated, **2**: 260, 261, 263, 277, 281, 282, 306, [353
—— urged Hayes to repudiate politicians of the Grant following, **2**: 281
—— supported Adams for Governor (1876), **2**: 275, 277
—— considered that Tilden was really elected President, though perhaps by intimidation of voters, **2**: 283, 286, 287
—— favored settlement of the disputed election by an arbitration, and favored [the Electoral Commission, **2**: 292, 293, 294, 300, 356
—— disgusted at the partisanship of the Commission, **2**: 299–301, 303, 304
its independence of parties, churches, friends, etc. [*see also* SAMUEL BOWLES (III.)], **1**: 68–72, 96, 118, 171, 193–195, 359, 401, 403; **2**: 37, 48, 49, 66, 89–93, 99, 136, 187, 191–199, 217–221, 247, 248, 267, 268–273, 282, 314, 321, 356, 360, 395–401, 405, [444, 455, 457, 458
its independence of subscribers and advertisers, **1**: 68
its leadership in "Independent Journalism" (1872 *and after*), **1**: 69, 193, 194; **2**: [89, 90, 133, 442, 452
its full reports of political conventions:
—— Know-nothing National Conventions, Philadelphia (1855, '56), **1**: 137–[139, 149, 167, 168, 195
—— Democratic National Convention, Cincinnati (1856), **1**: 149, 150
—— first Republican National Convention, Philadelphia (1856), **1**: 150–152
—— Massachusetts Republican Convention (1866), **2**: 26
—— Democratic National Convention, New York (1868), **2**: 40–42
—— Liberal Republican National Convention, Cincinnati (1872), **2**: 179, 184–188
—— regular Republican National Convention, Philadelphia (1872), **2**: 189, 190
—— Republican National Convention, Cincinnati (1876), **2**: 259–261
letters from BOWLES, in Europe (1862), **1**: 367, 382; from the Pacific Coast, etc. (1865), **2**: 15; from Washington (1866), 22; from Pennsylvania (1866), 52; from [Colorado, etc. (1868), 81
latitude given its correspondents, **1**: 195
disregard of consistency and over-caution, **1**: 198; **2**: 406, 408
quest for novelty, **1**: 198, 199
wide scope of discussion, **2**: 326, 327, 357–423
sincerity and absence of conventionalism, **2**: 383
its staff, contributors, etc., **1**: 32, 35, 57, 58, 97–109, 187, 195, 199–202, 213, 387–390; **2**: 59, 68–74, 174, 295, 209, 214, 307, 308, 333, 334, 357, 375, 377, 382, 400, 404, [425, 426

Springfield *Republican.—Continued.*
its staff, contributors, etc. [*see severally:*

Adams, Charles H.,
Ames, Mary Clemmer,
Ashmun, George,
Bartlett, D. W. ("Van")
Bowles, B. F.,
Bowles, Samuel, Jr.,
Bryan, C. W.,
Calhoun, Wm. B.,
Cary, Alice,
Clark, Edward P.,
Cook, Mrs. F. H.,
Davis, S. H.,
Dawes, H. L.,
Field, Kate,
Gladden, Washington,
Griffin, S. B.,
Harte, Bret,
Holland, J. G.,
Hood, J. E.,
King, Edward,
Perry, A. L.,
Phelps, E. H.,
Pierce, John,
Pomeroy, Wm. M.,
Whitmarsh, Caroline S.]
Robinson, W. S. ("Warrington"),
Sanborn, F. B.,
Shipley, Jos. H.,
Stowe, William,
Sweetser, C. H.,
Trafton, Adeline,
Walker, Francis A.,
Warren, W. L.,
Webb, Charles H.,
Wells, David A.,
Whiting, C. G.,

a school of journalism, **1**: 387; **2**: 68, 72, 359, 377, 443, 449
its staff reorganized after dissolution of partnership (1872), **2**: 307, 308, 327, 332, 427
—— arranged for by BOWLES on his death-bed (1877), **2**: 439.

Stanbery, Henry, counsel for Pres. Johnson in impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 35.

Standish, Miles, ancestor of SAMUEL BOWLES, **1**: 4.

St. Anthony Falls of, BOWLES's visit to (1854), **1**: 101.

St. Louis, Mo., Democratic National Convention, nominating Tilden for President (1876), **2**: 260.

Stanton, Edwin M., of Pennsylvania; Attorney-general in Pres. Buchanan's Cabinet (1860), **1**: 278; Secretary of War in Pres. Lincoln's Cabinet, 346; in the "extreme right" of Republican party (1863), 390; antagonistic to Pres. Johnson, **2**: 33; declined Johnson's request to resign (1867), 33; suspended by Johnson, and Gen. Grant put in his place, 33; resumed office when Congress met (1868), 34; removed by Johnson, and Gen. Thomas made Secretary *ad interim*, 35; retained in his office, the Senate declaring his removal illegal (Feb. 21), 35, 37; his removal made a ground for the impeachment of the President by the House (Feb. 21), 35; succeeded as Secretary by Gen. Schofield, 38.

Star of the West, steamer, sent by Pres. Buchanan to supply the forts in Charleston harbor; fired upon by the Confederates; withdrew (Jan., 1861), **1**; 278.

Stearns, George L., of Massachusetts; promoted John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry (1859), **1**: 250.

Stearns, George M., of Chicopee, Mass.; spoke at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), **2**: 441, 447.

Stearns, ——, President of Amherst College; promoted BOWLES's election as trustee of the college (1866), **2**: 79.

Stebbins, Dr. Horatio, of California, **1**: 12.

Stephens, Alexander H., of Georgia; refused to support Gen. Scott for the Presidency, as not distinctively pro-Slavery (1852), **1**: 94; led opposition, in Congress, to exclusion of Slavery from the territories (1854), 116.

Stevens, Thaddeus, M. C. from Pennsylvania from 1859 till 1867; Republican leader in the House, **2**: 21: attacked Pres. Johnson's veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill (1866), 21; denounced by Johnson, 22; demanded confiscation, disfranchisement, etc., against the rebels, 27, 33, 38; personal hostility to Johnson, a manager of the impeachment of the President (1868), 35; died (Aug. 12, 1868), 21; his character, estimated by the *Republican*, 21.

Stewart, Alexander T., of New York; nominated by Grant as Secretary of the Treasury, but constitutionally ineligible (1868), **2**: 113; his exemption from the statute asked by Grant; his name withdrawn, 113.

Storrs, Richard S., D. D., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; BOWLES proposed traveling with him and Mrs. Storrs in Europe (1862), **1**: 314; visits from Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES, **2**: 48, 49; promoted BOWLES's election as trustee of Amherst College (1866), 79; reminiscences of BOWLES, 80.

Stoughton, George L., of New York; visited New Orleans, to investigate Louisiana Electoral vote (1876), **2**: 284; reported, vindicating the Returning Board, 287; counsel for the Republicans before the Electoral Commission, 297.

Stowe, Mrs. Harriet Beecher, of Hartford, Conn., **1**: 111; **2**: 165; her story, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," **1**: 111.

Stowe, Prof. Calvin E., of Hartford, Conn., **2**: 165.

Stowe, William, editor of the Springfield *Gazette*, **1**: 25; assistant editor of the *Republican*, 25, 57.

Strong, William, Justice U. S. Supreme Court, Republican, **2**: 292; member of the Electoral Commission (1876), 292, 294, 296; voted with the Republican majority ("8 to 7"), 297, 298, 299, 300; rebuked for partisanship, 300, 301.

Sumner, Charles, an editor of the San Francisco *Herald*, **2**: 146.

Sumner, Charles, of Boston, Mass.
his hostility to Slavery, **1**: 48, 90, 132, 136, 146; **2**: 131
his character and temper, **1**: 132, 196, 345, 346; **2**: 128, 130, 214, 423
in Massachusetts Whig Convention, supported resolution refusing Whig support to [any man not opposed to Slavery extension (1847), **1**: 48
bolted Whig Presidential nomination of Taylor, as not being anti-Slavery; joined the "Conscience Whigs" in supporting National Free-soil Convention at Buffalo, and Van Buren and Adams, candidates (1848), **1**: 52, 54, 90
elected to U. S. Senate, by coalition of Free-soilers and Democrats over R. C. Win- [throp (Whig) (1851), **1**: 92, 132
opposed territorial extension of Slavery in the Senate, **1**: 116
attended Massachusetts Republican Convention, which nominated Wilson for Gover- [nor (1854), **1**: 123
spoke, in Senate, denouncing pro-Slavery men, especially Senator Butler, of South [Carolina (1856), **1**: 146
beaten by Preston S. Brooks, M. C. from South Carolina, and incapacitated from [Congressional work, **1**: 146; **2**: 197
exultation through the South at the attack, **1**: 147, 148.
named in Massachusetts Republican Convention as candidate for Governor, but no influence with Pres. Lincoln, **1**: 346 [nomination made (1856), **1**: 156, 175
impatience at Lincoln's conservatism, **1**: 357, 419
his hostility averted by Lincoln's tact (1865), **1**: 419, *n*
led Radical element of Republican party in Massachusetts (1862), **1**: 357, 358, 359
opposed Lincoln's reconstruction of Louisiana, as giving too little to the freedmen [(1865), **1**: 419
denounced by Pres. Johnson for his course on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill (1866), [**2**: 22
proposed enactment of impartial suffrage throughout United States (1867), **2**: 32, 33
hostility to Pres. Johnson, **2**: 33
connived at Gen. Butler's political advancement (1868), **2**: 93
opposed Gen. Butler's election as Governor of Massachusetts (1871), **2**: 108
opposed Pres. Grant's scheme for annexing San Domingo (1871), **2**: 128, 130
punished by his deposition from chairmanship of Senate Committee on Foreign Rela- [tions, **2**: 130, 131
headed Republican opposition in Congress to the Grant Administration, **2**: 131, 194, [214
non-committal as to Liberal Republican movement (1872), **2**: 178, 184
suggested as Liberal candidate for President, **2**: 178, 180
favored Trumbull as Liberal nominee, **2**: 184
spoke in opposition to Grant's reëlection as President, **2**: 194
lampooned in *Harper's Weekly* cartoons by Nast, a Grant partisan, **2**: 197
declined Democratic nomination for Governor of Massachusetts, **2**: 199
treated by the *Republican* as an inexperienced theorizer, of no proved statesmanship [(1851), **1**: 92
supported by Bowles and the *Republican*, **1**: 136, 148, 173, 196, 390; **2**: 178, 180, 214
censured by Bowles and the *Republican* (1862), **1**: 358, 359, 419; **2**: 32, 93
meetings with Bowles, **1**: 196; **2**: 56, 108, 170.

Sweetser, Charles H., an editor of the *Republican*, **1**: 388; an editor of the *Round Table*, New York, 388.

Switzerland, Bowles's impressions of (1862), **1**: 370–385; **2**: 3, 13, 82, 84; Bowles traveled in, with his children and others (1870), 160; President of, arbitrated between the United States and Great Britain in the matter of the *Alabama* claims, etc. (1871), 121.

Switzerland of America, title of book on travels in the Far West by Bowles *(q. v.)*

Talbot, Thomas, of Billerica, Mass.; Lieut.-Governor of Massachusetts; became Governor by Washburn's election to U. S. Senate (1873), **2**: 271; vetoed liquor license law, 271; renominated by Prohibitionists in Republican Convention (1874); defeated, 271, 272.

Tammany Hall faction of New York Democrats, **2**: 95; controlled by Wm. M. Tweed, 136; exposed by the New York *Times* (1871), 109; its delegation admitted to Democratic State Convention under protest by Tilden, O'Conor, etc. (1871), 136; purged of the Tweed Ring, 136, 137, 190, 240; the ejected faction allied with the New York City Republicans (1875), 247.

Taney, Roger B., Chief-Justice U. S. Supreme Court, **1**: 220; decided, in the Dred Scott case, that no person of African descent could become an American citizen (1857), 220; decided that the Missouri compromise was unconstitutional, 221; decided that Congress could not exclude Slavery from the territories, 222; his decision denounced in the Northern states, 222-224.

Tapley, J. F., owned an interest in the *Republican*, **2**: 201; partnership dissolved by BOWLES (1872), 203, 204; established rival paper, 204–209.

Taylor, Gen. Zachary, of Kentucky, President of the United States (1849–50)
commander in war with Mexico (1846–48), **1**: 47
proposed as candidate for the Presidency, **1**: 51
non-committal as to Slavery and office-spoils, **1**: 51, 54
nominated President by the Whig National Convention (1848), **1**: 51
supported by the *Republican*, **1**: 54
elected, **1**: 55
favored admission of California as a free state, **1**: 79
died (July 9, 1850), **1**: 79.

Tennessee, voted for Bell (Union) for President (1860), **1**: 268
her doubtful attitude as to Secession (1861), **1**: 280
joined the Southern Confederacy after the fall of Sumter (April, 1861), **1**: 288
her loyalists recognized by making Andrew Johnson Vice-president for Lincoln's 2d [term (1864), **1**: 360
Kuklux organized (1866); repressed by Gov. Brownlow (1869), **2**: 125, 126
voted for Grant for President (1868), **2**: 43.
—— Greeley (Dem.), against Grant, for President (1872), **2**: 200.

Texas, treaty for its annexation signed by Pres. Tyler (1844), **1**: 26, 45
obtained by the United States as a result of the ensuing war with Mexico [*see* WAR]
its acquisition opposed by the *Republican*, **1**: 26, 46 (1846–8), **1**: 45–48
Slavery established in, **1**: 45, 74
joined the Southern Confederacy after the fall of Fort Sumter (1861), **1**: 288
not "reconstructed" in time to vote at Presidential election (1868), **2**: 43
"reconstructed," and representatives admitted to Congress (1871), **2**: 115
her (Republican) Legislature adopted the 15th Amendment (enfranchising negroes, [etc.), completing its ratification, **2**: 115
voted for Greeley (Dem.) for President, against Grant (1872), **2**: 200.

Thayer, Eli, of Worcester, Mass.; organized the New England Emigrant Aid Society, to exclude Slavery from Kansas (1854), **1**: 128.

Thomas, Gen. Lorenzo, appointed *ad interim* Secretary of War, *vice* Stanton (1868), **2**: 35.

Thomas, Judge B. F., of Massachusetts; counsel for Willis Phelps in libel suit against BOWLES (1875), **2**: 316.

Thompson, Charles P., Democrat, of Massachusetts; defeated B. F. Butler for Congress (1874), **2**: 272.

Thompson, Col. James M., of Springfield, Mass.; named for Mayor, BOWLES having declined nomination; but defeated by railroad jobbers (1873), **2**: 311.

Thompson, George, an English Abolitionist, **1**: 87; held an anti-Slavery meeting in Springfield (1851), 87–90, 96; quarreled with the *Republican*, 89.

Thompson, Jacob, of Mississippi; Secretary of Interior in Buchanan's Cabinet, (1857), **1**: 224.

Thompson, Richard W., Republican, of Indiana; Secretary of the Navy in Pres. Hayes's Cabinet (1877), **2**: 304.

Thornton, Sir Edward, British Minister at Washington; proposed an arbitration of sundry international questions (1871), **2**: 120; admitted the *Alabama* claims in the arbitration, 120; British commissioner in the Anglo-American joint commission, 121.

Thurman, Allen G., Democrat, U. S. Senator from Ohio; opposed Sherman's bill for resuming specie payments (1874), **2**: 241; aspired to the Presidency (1875), 244; tolerated Gov. Allen's demand for inconvertible paper currency (1875), 244; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), 288; advocated creation of an Electoral Commission, 294; made a member of the Commission, 296; argued against legality of Louisiana Returning Board, 298.

Tiffany, Rev. Francis, Pastor Unitarian Church, Springfield, **1**: 390, 418; sold his house to SAMUEL BOWLES (1864), 390; **2**: 432; performed marriage of BOWLES's daughter (1874), 330; introduced by BOWLES to G. W. Smalley, of London (1877), 424; letter from BOWLES (1877), 431; spoke at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441, 445.

Tilden, Samuel J., Democrat, of New York; opposed the Tammany Hall faction (1871), **2**: 137, 191, 245, 246; renovated the New York Democracy, 191; eminent as a lawyer, 245, 246; political skill, 245, 260; elected Governor over John A. Dix (1874), 245; tolerated, then opposed, "Boss" Tweed, 245, 246, 280; services against the Tweed Ring, 246, 247, 280; services against the New York Canal Ring (1875), 246, 247; attacked by Administration Republicans, 247, 260, 280; supported by the *Republican*, 247, 261, 348, 356; favored by Civil Service reformers for the Presidency (1876), 255, 260, 263, 348, 429; nominated for President by Democratic National Convention

(1876), 260; his letter accepting the Presidential candidacy, 263, 278; his election in doubt, 282–303, 355; referred to an Electoral Commission, 292–300; contest in Congress, 284, 293–303; bribery of electors attempted in his behalf, 290; Presidency given to Hayes, 303.
Tileston, "Master," a Boston schoolteacher, preceptor of Samuel Bowles (I.), **1**: 2.
Tilton, Theodore, of Brooklyn, N. Y., **2**: 56; promoted Greeley's nomination for President (1872), 212.
"Titcomb, Timothy," pseudonym of J. G. Holland *(q. v.)*
Toombs, Robert, U. S. Senator from Georgia; refused to support Gen. Scott for the Presidency, as not distinctively pro-Slavery (1852), **1**: 94; participated in public meeting in honor of Preston S. Brooks, for his assault on Charles Sumner (1856), 147; threatened disunion, 147, 259; stated the ultimatum of the South (1860), 277; left Congress to join the Confederacy, 277; prepared Georgia's declaration of Secession, 270.
Topeka, Kansas; made the territorial capital by the anti-Slavery party in Kansas [*see* KANSAS] (1857), **1**: 225.
Toucey, Isaac, of Connecticut, Secretary of Navy in Buchanan's Cabinet (1857), **1**: 222.
Trafton, Adeline, of Springfield, Mass.; writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389.
Trafton, Rev. Mark, of Springfield, Mass.; Know-nothing member of Congress (1854), **1**: 156; Independent candidate (1856); defeated, 156, 176.
Treaty of Washington [*see* WASHINGTON].
Trollope, Anthony, 1: 71.
Trumbull, Lyman, U. S. Senator from Illinois; on the proposed support of Douglas by Republicans *in* 1858, **1**: 234; voted to acquit Pres. Johnson, impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 37; opposed Pres. Grant's deposition of Sumner from chairmanship of Committee on Foreign Affairs (1871), 130; opposed the Grant Administration, 131, 194; declared for the Liberal Republican movement (1872), 178; suggested for President or Vice-president (1872), 178, 180, 184, 186; declined nomination for Vice-president, 187; visited New Orleans to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), **2**: 284.
Tweed, Wm. M. ("Boss" T.), of New York; demoralization of New York politics, courts, etc., by his "Ring," **2**: 94, 98; alliance with James Fisk, Jr. (1868), 94; exposed and defeated by the New York *Times* (1871), 109; controlled the Tammany Democracy of New York (1871), 136; caricatured by Nast, 197; deserted by S. J. Tilden, head of Democratic State Committee, 245.
Tyler, John, (1790–1862), of Virginia; President of the United States (1841–5); approved the annexation of Texas, **1**: 26, 45, 46.
Tyng, Rev. Dr. Stephen A., of New York; preached duty of Emancipation in Fast Day sermon (1861), **1**: 351.

Union Relief Association, of Springfield, **2**: 326, 410, 422, 437.
United States Armory [*see* HARPER'S FERRY, *also* SPRINGFIELD].
Unitarianism in New England, **1**: 9.
United States Supreme Court, subservient to the Slavery interest and the dominant party, **1**: 116, 219, 238; the Dred Scott decision (March 6, 1857), 219–224, 238; declared by the New York Legislature to have "lost the confidence and respect of the people," 223; its decision held by Lincoln to be "not a political rule binding the voters, Congress, or the President" (1858), 224; discussion of the decision evaded by S. A. Douglas (1858), 240, 241, 257; the Republican party strengthened by it, 242; proved inoperative except by forcible Federal enforcement, 246; 5 justices of the court appointed members of the Electoral Commission to determine the Hayes-Tilden disputed Presidential election (1877), **2**: 292–296, 300, 356; non-partisan action of the justices guaranteed by Mr. Hoar, 295; the 3 Republican justices persistently voted with their party, 297, 298, 299; their partisanship denounced, 300; popular respect for the integrity of the court impaired, 301.

Utah, obtained as a result of the war with Mexico (1845–48), **1**: 47, 74
purpose to establish Slavery in, **1**: 74, 76
at first a part of New Mexico, **1**: 76
BOWLES'S visit to (1865), **2**: 5, 11
—— view of the Mormons, their industry, polygamy, etc., **2**: 5, 11.

Vail, Dr. H. R., teacher of BOWLES in boyhood, **1**: 16.
Vallandigham, Clement L., of Ohio; anti-War Democratic candidate for Governor, defeated (1863), **1**: 357; leader in Democratic National Convention (1868), **2**: 42; urged acceptance of reconstruction measures by the South (1871), 134.
"Van," pseudonym of D. W. Bartlett *(q. v.)*
Van Buren, Martin, of New York, President of the United States (1837–41); nominated for President by Free-soil and

Liberty parties (1848), **1**: 52, 53; "the Northern man with Southern principles," 53; defeated, with no electoral vote, 55.

Van Winkle, Peter G., U. S. Senator from West Virginia; voted to acquit Pres. Johnson, impeachment trial (1868), **2**: 37.

Vicksburg, Miss., taking of, **1**: 343, 363.

Virginia, English aristocratic influences in its early political development, **1**: 10
voted for Buchanan (Dem.) for President; Secession threatened if Fremont (Rep.) voted for Bell (Union) for President (1860), **1**: 268 [were elected (1856), **1**: 154
called a convention of states still unseceded, to avoid disunion (1861), **1**: 280, 285, 287
efforts of her Unionists to preserve the Union, **1**: 280
—— Lincoln to keep her in the Union, **1**: 287
joined the Southern Confederacy after the fall of Fort Sumter (April, 1861), **1**: 288
not "reconstructed" in time to vote at Presidential election (1868), **2**: 43
"reconstructed" and representatives admitted to Congress (1871), **2**: 115
BOWLES traveled in (1877), **2**: 416.

Wade, Benjamin F., U. S. Senator from Ohio; opinion as to Secession (1860), **1**: 277; aspiration to Presidency by impeachment of Johnson (1868), **2**: 38.

Waite Morrison R., of Ohio; made Chief-Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court by Pres. Grant (1874), **2**: 231.

Walker, Amasa, of North Brookfield, Mass.; at Massachusetts Republican Convention, **1**: 123; of the Republican "extreme right" (1863), 390.

Walker, Gen. Francis A., of Massachusetts; on the staff of the *Republican* (1868), **2**: 68; reminiscences of BOWLES, 70, 173; meetings with BOWLES, 150, 169; with BOWLES in England (1871), 173; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254.

Walker, Rev. Dr., his sermons (1862), **1**: 336.

Walker, Robert J., of Mississippi; appointed, by Pres. Buchanan, Democratic Governor of Kansas (1857), **1**: 224; endeavored to conciliate the Free-state party, 225; rejected fraudulent election returns (1857), 226; opposed by Buchanan's Administration, 226; resigned (1857), 227; published denunciation of Buchanan's treachery (1857), 227.

Walker, William, his filibustering operations against Nicaragua, **1**: 246.

Wall Street [*see* NEW YORK (City)].

Walley, Samuel H., of Massachusetts; Whig candidate for Governor; defeated by Gardner (1855), **1**: 143, 144.

Ware, Rev. John, of Cambridge, Mass.; called to Unitarian Church, Springfield (1865), **1**: 417.

Warner, Charles Dudley, of the *Courant*, Hartford, Conn.; his account of his farewell interview with BOWLES (1877), **2**: 433; spoke at BOWLES'S memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 441, 444, 447.

Warren, Fitz-Henry, of Burlington, Iowa, **1**: 303.

Warren, Wilmot L., associate editor of the *Republican* (1868), **2**: 68, 158, 307.

"Warrington," pseudonym of Wm. S. Robinson *(q. v.)*

Wars, American Revolution: its social influence in New England, **1**: 7
—— resulting political problems, **1**: 10
Mexican (1846–8), **1**: 46
—— caused by the annexation of Texas to the United States, **1**: 26, 46
—— favored by the Democratic party and advocates of Slavery, **1**: 46, 47, 48, 74
—— opposed by Whigs, **1**: 45, 46, 73
—— —— the *Republican*, **1**: 26, 46, 73
—— —— J. R. Lowell in his *Biglow Papers*, **1**: 47
—— insured by the election of Polk as President (1844), **1**: 46, 47
—— Gen. Taylor's and Scott's victories, **1**: 47, 48
—— resulted in acquisition of California, New Mexico, Utah, etc. [*see also* Black Hawk: Abraham Lincoln a volunteer in, **1**: 235 [SLAVERY], **1**: 47, 48, 110
Civil War in United States (1861–5):
—— its prelude and outbreak [*see* SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY], **1**: 269–288, 309
—— its conduct and conclusion, **1**: 341–363, 394
—— damage to foreign commerce by rebel cruisers, **1**: 344
—— its destruction of Slavery *(q. v.)*, **1**: 394, 415, 416
—— occasioned complications with Great Britain, settled by the Treaty of [Washington (1871), **2**: 119–123.

Washburn, Emory, Whig, Governor of Massachusetts; renominated for Governor, by Whig Convention, Worcester (1854), **1**: 122; defeated by H. J. Gardner, Know-nothing, 125.

Washburn, Israel, Jr., M. C. from Maine; opposed territorial extension of Slavery (1854), **1**: 116; suggested meeting at which the formation of the Republican party was agreed upon (May 26, 1854), 117.

Washburn, Wm. B., of Greenfield, Mass.; nominated by Republicans for Governor (1871); elected, **2**: 108, 109; nominated for Governor, over Gen. Butler, by Republicans (1873), 264; supported by the *Republican*, against Gaston (Dem.); elected, 266; elected U. S. Senator, to fill Sumner's unexpired term, defeating Hoar and Dawes, 267, 271, 272; succeeded as Senator by Dawes (1874), 273, 341.

Washburne, Elihu B., of Illinois; opposed territorial extension of Slavery (1854), **1**: 116; as M. C., favored economy and opposed jobs, **2**: 143 and *n*.; Secretary of State in Pres. Grant's Cabinet (1869), 113, 144; Minister to France (1869), 113.

Washington, D. C. [*see also* DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA], first telegraphic dispatch between it and Baltimore (1844), **1**: 26; BOWLES's visits to, 101, 208; *in* 1865, 415–417; *in* 1866, **2**: 22, 49; *in* 1868, 56; *in* 1870, 156, 157; *in* 1872, 178, 179, 189; *in* 1875, 345; BOWLES's liking for the place and objections, 157, 428, 430.

Washington, Treaty of, between Great Britain and the United States, settling international differences (1871), **2**: 119–123.

Washington Territory, BOWLES's visits and impressions (1865), **2**: 5, 9.

Wasson, Rev. David A., **1**: 418.

Watterson, Henry, editor of the *Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Ky.; independence in journalism, **2**: 133, 418; editorial capacity, 134; urged acceptance of reconstruction measures by the South (1871), 134, 418; attended Liberal Republican National Convention, Cincinnati (1872), 184; disgusted at Greeley's nomination for President, 187; delegate to Democratic National Convention, St. Louis (1876), 261; visited New Orleans, to investigate Louisiana electoral vote (1876), 284; opposed Democratic plan of filibustering in the House, to prevent Hayes being declared President (1876), 301; meetings with BOWLES in Washington (1875), 345; trip with BOWLES in Kentucky, etc. (1877), 416, 417; article, in the *Courier-Journal*, on BOWLES's death (1878), 449; letters from BOWLES (1877), 418.

Wayland, Prof. Francis, spoke at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), **2**: 441.

Webb, Charles H. ("John Paul"), **2**: 56; writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389.

Webster, Daniel, Whig, U. S. Senator from Massachusetts; popularity with Massachusetts Whigs, **1**: 41, 48, 78, 91, 93, 94, 96, 131
popularity in Boston, **1**: 131
supported the Wilmot Proviso, excluding Slavery from newly-acquired territory (1846), **1**: 47
spoke at Massachusetts Whig Convention, opposing Mexican war, territorial extension, and growth of Slavery (1847), **1**: 48
abandoned principle of the Wilmot Proviso, supporting Clay's Compromise scheme and restitution of fugitive slaves; speech in U. S. Senate (March 7, 1850), **1**: 41, 77–81, 90, 131
was denounced in Massachusetts, **1**: 78
introduced Fugitive Slave Bill, providing jury trial for the fugitive; defeated, **1**: 79, 80
acknowledged Fugitive Slave Law, **1**: 80
made Secretary of State in Pres. Fillmore's Cabinet (1850), **1**: 79
succeeded in the Senate by Robert C. Winthrop (1850), **1**: 80
named for Presidential candidate by Massachusetts Whig Convention (1847), **1**: 48
defeated for Presidential nomination by Gen. Taylor (1848), **1**: 51, 55
—— —— —— Gen. Scott (1852), **1**: 94
died (1852), **1**: 117
his personal friendships, **1**: 41, 79
—— George Ashmun, **1**: 41, 76
supported by the *Republican*, **1**: 49, 78, 79, 96; **2**: 17
his devotion to the Union and American Nationality, **1**: 80, 81, 93
—— non-conception of Secession and Emancipation, **1**: 197
—— —— evil of Slavery, **1**: 81
opposed by Horace Mann, **1**: 91, 301
power in statement, **2**: 376
selfishness of his ambition, **1**: 41
ruined by his desire for the Presidency, **2**: 423.

Weed, Thurlow, Whig, New York; editor of the Albany *Evening Journal*, **1**: 276; as an election manager, 37, 302: as journalist, 67; personal influence in politics, 67, 302; avoided office-seeking, 67; use of political patronage, 299, 300; **2**: 183; allied with Seward in controlling the Whig party in New York, **1**: 117; opposed the Kansas-Nebraska policy of Pierce's Administration (1854), 117; met BOWLES at Albany (1860), 302; led the party for Seward in Republican Presidential Convention, Chicago (1860), 262, 302; proposed averting Secession by

restoring Missouri Compromise line and compensating owners of fugitive slaves (1860), 276; urged conciliation of the South, 277.
Weiss, Rev. John, his *Life of Theodore Parker* (1864), **1**: 410.
Wells, David Ames, of Connecticut, **1**: 16; writer for the *Republican*, 389; excursion, with BOWLES, etc., to Pennsylvania coal regions (1866), **2**: 52; attempted to secure C. F. Adams's nomination for President (1872), 181; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; on reconstruction of the South (1874), 335.
Welles, Gideon, of Connecticut; Secretary of the Navy in Lincoln's Cabinet (1861), **1**: 282.
West Indies [*see* SAN DOMINGO, HAYTI].
Weston, Dr. J. D., of Massachusetts; Democratic candidate for Congress (1856), defeated, **1**: 156, 176.
Wheeler, Wm. A., Republican, of New York; on committee to investigate Louisiana political troubles (1875), **2**: 236; reported, condemning Returning Board, but favoring Kellogg's government, 237; effected a compromise, making Kellogg Governor and giving Democrats a majority in the Legislature, 237; nominated for Vice-president at Cincinnati Convention (1876), 260; his letter of acceptance, 263; sectional policy during the canvass, 278, 281; his election in doubt [*see* HAYES, R. B.), 282–303; declared Vice-president, 303; estimate of him by BOWLES, 424.
White, Chauncey, foreman in the *Republican* office, **1**: 15, 33, 53.
White, Horace, editor of the *Tribune*, Chicago, **2**: 133; editor of the *Evening Post*, N. Y.; on early American journalism, **1**: 26; independence in journalism, **2**: 133, 442; attended Liberal Republican National Convention, Cincinnati (1872), 184; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), 254; spoke at BOWLES's memorial service (Jan. 23, 1878), 442.
White Mountains, carriage journey of BOWLES to, with Charles Allen (July, Aug., 1861), **1**: 310, 320–328; visit of Mr. and Mrs. BOWLES to (1867), **2**: 55.
Whitefield, J. W., fraudulently elected to Congress from Kansas by pro-Slavery Missourians (1854), **1**: 129.
Whiting, Charles G., associate editor of the *Republican* (1868), **2**: 68, 308; reminiscences of BOWLES, 68.
Whitmarsh, Caroline S., writer for the *Republican*, **1**: 389; **2**: 153.
Whitney, Maria, visited Mrs. BOWLES in Springfield (1862), **1**: 371, 380; *in* 1874, **2**: 342; staid in New York with Mrs. BOWLES (1863), **1**: 400, 403, 404, 406, 412; traveled and studied with Miss S. BOWLES in Europe (1869–71), **2**: 148, 160, 171; visited BOWLES in his last illness (1877), **2**: 435; letters from BOWLES, *in* 1861, **1**: 317; *in* 1862, 344, 370, 379; *in* 1863, 393–400, 409; *in* 1864, 409–418; *in* 1866, **2**: 48, 50; *in* 1868, 56; *in* 1869, 148, 152; *in* 1870, 155, 158, 159, 161, 164; *in* 1877, 432.
Whitney, M. B., of Westfield, Mass.; counsel for Willis Phelps in libel suit against BOWLES (1875), **2**: 316.
Whittier, John Greenleaf, of Amesbury, Mass.; his opposition to Slavery, **1**: 74; leader in the Free-soil party, 91; battle-songs, 345; poems, 411.
Wilderness, Battle of the, **1**: 363.
Wilkes, George, editor of the N.Y. *Spirit of the Times*, **2**: 169.
Willard, George, Republican, M. C. from Michigan; opposed Sherman's bill for resuming specie payment (1874), **2**: 242; on joint Committee of Conference on disputed Presidential Election (1876), 288.
Williams College, Mass.; favored by BOWLES and the *Republican*, **2**: 79.
Williams, George H., of Oregon; commissioner on the *Alabama* claims, Canada Fisheries, etc. (1871), **2**: 121; Attorney-General in Grant's Cabinet, 231; nominated successor to Chief-Justice Chase, but withdrawn (1873), 231.
Williams, Thomas, M. C. from Pennsylvania; manager in impeachment of Pres. Johnson (1868), **2**: 35.
Wilmot, David, M. C. from Pennsylvania; his "Proviso" excluding Slavery from newly-acquired territory, **1**: 46, 48.

Wilson, Henry, of Massachusetts; delegate to Whig National Convention (1848), **1**: [52
bolted Taylor's nomination for President, **1**: 52
supported Free-soil party (Van Buren), **1**: 52, 54, 90
favored coalition with Democrats against the Whigs (1850), **1**: 91
Republican candidate for Governor (1854), **1**: 123
used the Know-nothing party (1854, '55), **1**: 124, 125, 132, 136, 155, 169, 170
U. S. Senator (1855–72), **1**: 132, 136; **2**: 189
led Northern party in American (Know-nothing) National Convention at Philadelphia, [which split on the Slavery issue (1855), **1**: 137, 138
assisted in organizing Republican party in Massachusetts (1855), **1**: 139
in Senate, denounced P. S. Brooks's assault on Sumner; was challenged by Brooks; [refused to fight (1856), **1**: 147
in Massachusetts Republican Convention, urged nomination of Gardner (Know-[nothing) for Governor (1856), **1**: 155

Wilson, Henry.—*Continued.*
in Massachusetts Republican Convention, worked for Fremont for President, **1**: 175
opposed measures for establishing Slavery in Kansas, **1**: 225
visited Kansas and counseled Republican leaders (1857), **1**: 225
favored reëlection to U. S. Senate of S. A. Douglas (anti-Administration Democrat), [from Illinois (1857), **1**: 229
urged conciliatory policy toward the conquered South (1867), **2**: 30
—— universal suffrage, **2**: 30
opposed Gen. Butler's nomination by Republicans for Governor of Massachusetts [(1871), **2**: 108
opposed Pres. Grant's deposition of Sumner from chairmanship of Senate Committee [on Foreign Relations (1871), **2**: 130
candidate for Vice-president, Grant's 2d term (1872); elected, **1**: 179, 189, 200, 213
without influence on Grant's Administration, **2**: 273
presided over Massachusetts Republican Convention (1875), **2**: 273
died (November, 1875), **2**: 273
his account of the origin of the Republican party, in his *Rise and Fall of the Slave* [*Power*, **1**: 117
his self-seeking in politics, **1**: 124
prone to political trades, coalitions, etc., **1**: 132, 136; **2**: 219
opposition to Slavery, **1**: 52, 54, 90, 132, 136, 225
statesmanlike methods in politics, **1**: 190
connection with the Credit Mobilier transaction, **2**: 219, 227
opposed by BOWLES and the *Republican*, **1**: 136; supported, 136, 138, 196; **2**: 30, 264

Winthrop, Robert C., of Boston, Mass.; attitude in Massachusetts Whig Convention (1847), **1**: 48; succeeded Webster in U. S. Senate (1850), 80; voted against the Fugitive Slave Law, 80; defeated by Sumner in election for U. S. Senate (1851), 92; nominated for Governor by the Whigs (1851); defeated, 93; conservative as to Slavery, 131; urged to lead the Republican movement in Massachusetts (1855), 139.

Winthrop, Theodore, his novel, *John Brent*, **1**: 335.

Wise, Henry A., Democrat, of Virginia; elected Governor, defeating the Know-nothings (1855), **1**: 137; leader of the disunion faction, supporting Buchanan for President (1856), 154; supported Buchanan's Administration, 228; hanged John Brown (1859), 254; threatened disunion in case of Republican election (1859), 259.

Wood, Fernando, of New York; political power in New York City, **1**: 228, 357; supported by Pres. Buchanan (1857), 228; aided Secession, 357; led the opposition to filibustering in Congress against admitting the election of Hayes as President (1876), **2**: 302.

Woodford, Stewart L., Republican, of New York; in Ohio campaign (1875), attacked Democratic doctrine of inconvertible paper currency, **2**: 244.

Woolsey, Theodore D., D. D., President of Yale College; attended Reform Conference, New York (1876), **2**: 254.

Worcester (Mass.) *Spy*, opposed railroad jobs in Massachusetts, **2**: 158; favored Bristow's nomination for President (1876), 253.

Wright, Elizur, of Massachusetts; supported Liberal Republican movement (1872), **2**: 179.

Wyandotte, Kansas, the State Constitution framed at, **2**: 231.

Yo Semite, little known until Pacific railroads were built, **2**: 2; BOWLES's impressions of (1865, '8, '9), 12, 13, 63, 84, 147.

York, England, BOWLES's visit to (1871), **2**: 174.

Youmans, Prof. E. L., of New York; on the necessity of physical rest, **2**: 61, *n.*

PRESS OF THEO. L. DE VINNE & CO., NEW-YORK.

WITHDRAWN
UST
Libraries

DATE DUE

AUG 28 '96

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

College of St. Thomas Library
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

101633

Merriam, George.

v.2

The life and times
of Samuel Bowles.